

1-1-2006

## The influence of student's spanish lexicon on english as a foreing language classes

Jorge Enrique Penagos Gaitán  
*Universidad de La Salle, Bogotá*

Martha Lucia Granados Salazar  
*Universidad de La Salle, Bogotá*

Edgar Lucero Babativa  
*Universidad de La Salle, Bogotá*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ciencia.lasalle.edu.co/lic\\_lenguas](https://ciencia.lasalle.edu.co/lic_lenguas)

---

### Citación recomendada

Penagos Gaitán, J. E., Granados Salazar, M. L., & Babativa, E. L. (2006). The influence of student's spanish lexicon on english as a foreing language classes. Retrieved from [https://ciencia.lasalle.edu.co/lic\\_lenguas/91](https://ciencia.lasalle.edu.co/lic_lenguas/91)

This Trabajo de grado - Pregrado is brought to you for free and open access by the Facultad de Ciencias de la Educación at Ciencia Unisalle. It has been accepted for inclusion in Licenciatura en Español y Lenguas Extranjeras by an authorized administrator of Ciencia Unisalle. For more information, please contact [ciencia@lasalle.edu.co](mailto:ciencia@lasalle.edu.co).

**THE INFLUENCE OF STUDENT'S SPANISH LEXICON ON ENGLISH AS A  
FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSES**

**EDGAR LUCERO BABATIVA  
JORGE ENRIQUE PENAGOS GAITÁN  
MARTHA LUCÍA GRANADOS SALAZAR**

**LA SALLE UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY OF EDUCATION  
LICENCIATURA EN LENGUA CASTELLANA, INGLÉS Y FRANCÉS  
BOGOTÁ, D.C.  
2006**

**THE INFLUENCE OF STUDENT'S SPANISH LEXICON ON ENGLISH AS A  
FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSES**

**EDGAR LUCERO BABATIVA  
JORGE ENRIQUE PENAGOS GAITÁN  
MARTHA LUCÍA GRANADOS SALAZAR**

**Monograph to obtain the degree of:  
LICENCIADO EN LENGUA CASTELLANA, INGLÉS Y FRANCÉS**

**Project Manager  
PhD. FLOR MARINA HERNÁNDEZ**

**LA SALLE UNIVERSITY  
FACULTY OF EDUCATION  
LICENCIATURA EN LENGUA CASTELLANA, INGLÉS Y FRANCÉS  
BOGOTÁ, D.C.  
2006**

---

**Faculty Director's Signature**

---

**Project Manager's Signature**

---

**Jury's Signature**

**Date: November 2006**

*We dedicate this monograph to those who devote their talent, their energy and their affection to provide a solid foundation for EFL teaching, daring to overcome primitive thoughts and searching beyond typical inquiries.*

*This work is also to those who have committed us with culture and knowledge by offering all of their skill, effort and intelligence to help transform minds, they have truly influenced our lives and opened everyday the doors of the world for us.*

*Finally, as a research team, but firstly as close friends, we dedicate this monograph to each other, to the friendship, devotion and perseverance that have led us together to reach this arrival point. To all the sacrifices we made so that our minds may be free.*

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

We are truly indebted to our project manager, PhD. Flor Marina Hernández, who, with her unsurpassing dedication, labored over the chaos of the manuscript to a readable, stylish form. Her request for clarifications, restructurings, and useful feedback were nearly always warranted and confirmed of having a talented and interested reader to assess our monograph.

During the process of proposing this work to La Salle University, we have been fortunate to have had a deep encouragement of Professors Sandra Soler, Pedro Baquero, and Darío Naranjo, whose unfailing support helped us transform our proposal into a research project. We are also especially grateful to Professors Luis Eduardo Vásquez and Javier Salcedo who faithfully believed and supported the development of this monograph when it was most required. As well, we particularly want to thank Professor Mauro Hernandez for having accepted assessing this work as our jury and given us his crucial point of view.

We would also like to thank Professors Zaide Figueredo, Jair Ayala, and Monsieur Jairo Gutiérrez for their intellectual, cultural, and academic stimulation and encouragement, as well as having given us a new perspective of language teaching.

Equally, to many with no direct contact with language teaching who have exercised more influenced that they realized, by prompting us to think about learning, people values, and what it is in life that matters. Thanks to our students who so generously contributed their performances as examples for this work.

From the bottom of our hearts, thanks to our families for putting up with us while the research was developed and written. God bless them all!

## CONTENTS

	Page
<b>ANNEXES CONTENT .....</b>	2
<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	3
<b>1. GENERALITIES OF THE MONOGRAPH.....</b>	5
1.1 Title .....	5
1.2 Question.....	5
1.3 Description of the Problem .....	5
1.4 Antecedents .....	6
1.5 Justification .....	8
1.6 Objectives .....	9
<b>2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK .....</b>	10
<b>2.1 Basic Communicative Concepts in either Acquisition or Learning Process .....</b>	11
<b>2.2 L1 and L2 Learning Process .....</b>	15
2.2.1 L1 Grammatical System Development.....	16
2.2.2 L2 Learning Process .....	18
2.2.3 Systematic Errors as Strategies for L2 Learning .....	19
2.2.4 Non-systematic errors. More Strategies for L2 Learning .....	20
2.2.5 L2 Grammatical System Development .....	21
2.2.6 L2 Grammatical Sequences .....	22
<b>2.3 L1 Influences on L2 Learning Process .....</b>	25
2.3.1 Characteristics of Second Language Acquisition .....	25
2.3.2 Factors affecting second Language Learning .....	28
2.3.3 Explanation of Krashen's L2 Acquisition theory .....	30
2.3.4 L1 interference in Krashen's theory .....	34
2.3.5 Age as a variable in L2 Acquisition Krashen's theory .....	34
<b>2.4 L1 Lexicon Influence on L2 Learning Process .....</b>	35
<b>2.5 English Language Teaching Methods and Approaches .....</b>	40
<b>3. METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK .....</b>	47
3.1 Type of Research .....	47
3.2 Instruments .....	48
3.3 Description of Groups Observed .....	49
3.4 Description of the groups' EFL Programs .....	51
3.5 Stages and Procedures .....	55
<b>4. FINAL REPORT .....</b>	61
<b>5. CONCLUSIONS .....</b>	64
<b>6. RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	67
<b>ANNEXES .....</b>	69
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	

## ANNEXES CONTENT

	<b>Page</b>
Annex No.1. Observation 1 Adults .....	69
Annex No.2. Observation 2 Adults .....	70
Annex No.3. Observation 3 Adults .....	71
Annex No.4. Observation 4 Adults .....	72
Annex No.5. Observation 5 Adults .....	73
Annex No.6. Observation 6 Adults .....	74
Annex No.7. Observation 7 Adults .....	75
Annex No.8. Observation 8 Adults .....	76
Annex No.9. Observation 9 Adults .....	77
Annex No.10. Observation 10 Adults .....	79
Annex No.11. Observation 11 Adults .....	82
Annex No.12. Observation 12 Adults .....	84
Annex No.13. Observation 13 Adults .....	86
Annex No.14. Observation 1 Adolescents.....	90
Annex No.15. Observation 2 Adolescents.....	91
Annex No.16. Observation 3 Adolescents.....	92
Annex No.17. Observation 4 Adolescents.....	93
Annex No.18. Observation 5 Adolescents.....	94
Annex No.19. Observation 6 Adolescents.....	95
Annex No.20. Observation 7 Adolescents.....	96
Annex No.21. Observation 8 Adolescents.....	97
Annex No.22. Observation 1 Children.....	98
Annex No.23. Observation 2 Children.....	99
Annex No.24. Observation 3 Children.....	100
Annex No.25. Observation 4 Children.....	101
Annex No.26. Observation 5 Children.....	102
Annex No.27. Observation 6 Children.....	103
Annex No.28. Observation 7 Children.....	104
Annex No.29. Category 1: Referential Meaning.....	106
Annex No.30. Category 2: Failure.....	112
Annex No.31. Category 3: Interference .....	117
Annex No.32. Class work 9 .....	121



## INTRODUCTION

The use of the mother tongue (L1) in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classes has recently been a matter of research of many linguists and teachers. They have stated that L1 usage functions naturally as a student's cognitive strategy when learning L2. In addition, they have demonstrated that L1 generates different influences on language learning such as contextual variability plus phonetic, syntactic and semantic interference. However, a more detailed academic work about Spanish semantic influence on this process has not been developed directly.

As it is stated in the Generalities, this monograph attempts to offer a comprehensive analysis to visualize a new horizon about Spanish lexicon influence on EFL learning process, since it is the learner and his language production what must be observed to reach effective teaching. Through methods and approaches, there have always been inquiries about how Spanish lexicon items participate in EFL classes, but there is not yet a work that deals exclusively with this subject.

No matter how original this monograph could be, its Theoretical Framework necessarily has to base on previous theories and approaches about language acquisition and L1 influence on L2 learning. Consecutively, the applicability of a revolutionary new type of research, as Systematization of Experiences is, must be followed since this study deals with observing in context in order to produce new insights about the subject; these data compose the Methodological Framework, the Conclusions, and the Recommendations.

It must be clearly understood that this monograph attempts neither to generalize L1 lexicon influence on every EFL learning context, nor to mention detailed analysis of language development. The results this work highlights exclusively come from the variety of groups observed to mention student's Spanish lexicon use as an important factor in learning. Besides, the conclusions and recommendations of this monograph entirely reside in our intellectual curiosity in learning process, in

perceptions about the knowledge acquired in the elaboration of this monograph, and our EFL teaching experience, but not in the authors cited in the theoretical framework.

Another aspect to take into account in this work is the use of some terms that usually maintains a useful feature without discussing any technical distinction. For instance, the term *second language* is used to preserve the unity of words within the sentence by covering the terms for both 'foreign' and 'second' language. As well, *learning* typically refers to either 'learning' or 'acquisition', and its use depends on the convention of internalizing language rather than contrasting it to 'acquisition'. Finally, whenever the pronouns 'he', 'his' or 'him' are used to refer to either the teacher, or the student, or the learner, their uses are purely a linguistic convention and do not imply the person is more likely to be male than female.

## **1. GENERALITIES OF THE MONOGRAPH**

### **1.1 TITLE**

The influence of Student's Spanish Lexicon on English as a Foreign Language classes.

### **1.2 QUESTION**

To what extend the learner's use of Spanish lexicon in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classes influences on the foreign language learning process.

#### **Sub Questions**

- Which are the main aspects related to EFL learning process?
- What kind of Spanish lexicon is used by students when learning English as a foreign language?
- In which moment is Spanish lexicon used by students in EFL classes?
- What is the students' purpose of using Spanish lexicon in EFL classes?
- What insights are found from Spanish lexicon influences on English learning process?

### **1.3 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROBLEM**

In EFL classes, the researchers have noticed that Spanish is used as an important tool to convey interaction by not only many of the students but also some teachers. To determine which specific situations about the question mentioned above are truly present in EFL learning, a variety of speaking activities was done in two groups chosen in two institutions.

The first group was composed of adults of different professions in High-Intermediate level (see annexes 1 to 4) who had been learning English through a conversational program for four months. They were attending just a two-hour

conversational class twice a week at *Praxis Language School*. The other group was composed of teenagers of 11<sup>th</sup> grade at *Thomas Jefferson School*; they presented special interest in learning a foreign language and were proficient in comprehending intermediate-level contents.

The observations taken in each group show that students use Spanish as a tool for comprehensible communication, such as asking for meanings of words, confirming structures of sentences, confirming teacher's questions, and gaining self confidence when making complex ideas.

Thus, it is seen that the students' needs for communication are directly related to the use of Spanish language lexicon in EFL classes, since the students observed use mother tongue lexical items to associate meanings of target language words, mainly to complete their utterances for an effective communication, then to comprehend teacher's inquiries, or to memorize English useful vocabulary.

To sum the problem, Spanish lexicon is frequently used by English language learners to interact with their teacher. For this reason, the EFL learning process might be influenced by the mother tongue; but to what extend the learners' use of Spanish lexicon in EFL class influences on this learning process is the outcome to reach.

#### **1.4 ANTECEDENTS**

Once the problem has been described, it was necessary to search into some universities in Bogotá in order to find academic works related to the use of Spanish lexicon in English language learning. Three works were just found:

Two of them were found at Pedagogica University. The first one is: "*Interferencias Lingüísticas Negativas a Nivel Sintáctico en el Aprendizaje Del Inglés Como Segunda Lengua*", by Doris Marín Fajardo, 1997. This work makes an analysis from theoretical trends about foreign language acquisition in children and adults. It

also considers global errors in utterances as instruments to examine interferences, and from them, to know until what point mother tongue interferes in English learning process. It concludes that mother tongue influences enormously on second language learning process due to learners always translate to communicate their ideas; as a result of this, learners omit second language rules making mistakes that will after become interferences.

The second monograph is: "*Desarrollo de la competencia léxica en inglés mediante el uso de un software con características hipertextuales*", by Patricia Moreno García, 1999. It lists brief data about the development of software to increase lexical competence in English learning students. It does not handle with any lexical influence on foreign language learning process, but registers useful concepts about lexis, since this software she made works from them to develop learner's lexical competences.

Finally, the last work is "*The use of memory strategies to store and retrieve vocabulary in English as a foreign language*" by Diana Patricia Gómez and Nancy Lozano Garzón, 1999 from La Javeriana University. It talks about the different processes and strategies of memorizing vocabulary by giving short explanations about how learners understand the meaning of second language words.

Unfortunately, no monographic work related to first language lexicon influence on Foreign Language learning was found neither at La Salle University nor at National University.

In contrast to these monographic works, relevant books in concern with the topic of this proposal have been found at the libraries of Javeriana University and Colombo English Language Center. The most important usefulness of these books, even though they do not give a deep conceptualization about the real role of Spanish lexicon in EFL learning, has been to provide clarity in regard to the situations perceived in the classes observed. In other words, they have been useful not only

to structure and delimitate the topic of the monograph, but also to understand and conceptualize the different categories and insights about students' Spanish use in EFL classes, which were taken from the observer's personal ethnographic journals.

## 1.5 JUSTIFICATION

According to the antecedents mentioned above, *it is clear that English language learning process may be influenced by the use of Spanish lexicon*, but, there is neither plenty of empirical nor theoretical support to establish at what extend this influence is exerted. It is due firstly to the lack of bibliographical texts closely dealing with this topic of research; and secondly, to the few monographic projects developed on this respect at Pedagogica, Javeriana, Los Andes, Nacional and La Salle University. By reason of this, there are great differences between this investigation and the ones already listed on the antecedents as well as the overview of the framework.

First, it is not wanted to deepen into interferences which have been fully described by different authors like Michael Swan and Bernard Smith (2001), but to establish if the use of Spanish Lexicon in EFL Classes either helps or not to get higher Second Language Learning; that is, how Spanish lexicon is used in classroom to enhance communication and negotiate meaning. Second, it is not an objective of the project to provide strategies to improve L2 learning, but to analyze and report the influence of Spanish lexicon on such process.

Subsequently, the main reasons why it is clearly important to research into this topic are:

- The quite unexplored field this monograph deals with, since the importance of Spanish lexicon used in EFL classes has not yet been revealed.
- The lack of sufficient evidence about the role of the Spanish lexicon in English language learning.

- The importance of providing teachers with relevant information concerning the learners' use of Spanish lexicon in EFL classrooms, avoiding the speculations about it.
- To provide a starting point to reflect on EFL teaching methodologies and paradigms; in particular, when learners circumstantially fall back on Spanish.

Being aware of how mother tongue lexicon influences on EFL learning will help not only teachers to become better professionals in effective EFL teaching, but also faculties of languages to get wider, more serious and scientific support when taking a responsible educational position on this respect.

## **1.6 OBJECTIVES**

### **General Objective**

To write a complete report about how the learner's use of Spanish lexicon in EFL classes influences on Foreign Language Learning.

### **Specific Objective**

- To identify the main theoretical trends related to the use of Mother Tongue in foreign classes.
- To observe a certain number of EFL classes in order to identify in which ones Spanish lexicon is whether used or not to learn the target language.
- To analyze the data collected from the described classes according to both the theoretical trends and the observations gathered.
- To identify how the learner's use, or not, of Spanish Lexicon influences on EFL Learning.

## **2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

The use of the learner's mother tongue (L1) when learning English, either as a second language (ESL) or as a Foreign Language (EFL), has recently been a subject of study of many researchers and teachers. While some of them argue that L1 causes negative learning processes, the others consider it as an underlying learning strategy that helps the learner understand L2. Nevertheless, both sides agree with seeing L1 influence from the L2 language learning process, they take into account the different stages the learner goes through when learning a new language; in spite of, L1 language learning process must be studied as well.

By the time, a general conclusion of the matter has not yet been reached due to the fact that there are several considerations to deal with separately when talking about L1 influence, such as, phonology, sentence structure, lexis, mental processes, motivation and affect. Among them, it is L1 lexicon what matters in this work since its directional question addresses to what extend the learner's use of Spanish lexicon in EFL class influences on the L2 learning process.

Therefore, the literature collected in this theoretical framework covers five aspects to recognize L1 and L2 language development from the understanding of the processes to the lexicon influence. In the first part, the basic communicative concepts in either acquisition or learning are explained. They permit the reader to familiarize with terms that are permanently used for comprehending language development. Subsequently, L1 and L2 learning processes are explained separately so that the comparison between the two processes will be clearly understood. In this section, the reader will also be able to recognize two points in L2 learning: L2 speaking errors as strategies for learning, and the L2 grammatical development. In the third part, a detailed review of L1 influences on L2 learning process is explicated. Accordingly, characteristics and factors affecting L2 learning in children and adults are contrasted to evaluate the level of learner's linguistic competence. In addition, Krashen's L2 Acquisition Theory is enlightened since this author develops a hypothesis of language acquisition by communicative aspects in



which L1 participation is clearly detailed. In the fourth part, the L1 influence is narrowed down to Lexicon. Thus, a short literature on lexical development is stated to reach the point of Lewis' Lexical Approach which is the one that deals with the nature and role of lexis in L2 learning. Along this section, the reader will be able to distinguish the different lexical items and the uses these items have in communication, in order to convey particular meanings. Finally, some language teaching methods and approaches are characterized exclusively since the L1 participation to highlight the role of grammar and lexicon in L2 learning.

Despite the fact that the last item of this theoretical framework deals with teaching, the content primarily refers to learning since this is what actually directs this monograph. Besides, the purpose of this literature is not to deepen on each of the topics mentioned above but to support terminology, evidence, and processes involved in L2 lexicon influence on L2 learning progression; so that, the research and insights of this work can be efficiently built.

## **2.1 Basic Communicative Concepts in either Acquisition or Learning Process**

When people want to learn English, they can do it in two environments: as a foreign language or as a second language. Learning English as a Foreign Language (EFL) means that the learner is not immersed in the environment where English is spoken as a native tongue. On the other hand, learning English as a Second Language (ESL) means that the learner is in an environment where English is used as the mother tongue (Gass 1997).

In addition, distinguishing between foreign language and mother tongue is important to understand the communicative function of either language inside the community where the learner lives (Littlewood 1984). Defining briefly the two concepts, the foreign language (L2) is the target language the learner wants to acquire, and the mother tongue (L1) is the learner's native language (Swan et al. 2001). The function of the target language is to be in contact with the outside of the

learner's community where that specific tongue is spoken, while the mother language will always have social functions within the learner's community (Littlewood 1998).

Both English language acquisition and English language learning can take place in either environment explained above. The difference between acquiring a new language and learning it resides in the way the process develops (Krashen 1987). The former is a subconscious process: the learners are not usually aware of the fact that they are acquiring language, but are only aware of the fact that they are using the language for communication; this is the act of either contracting, or assuming, or acquiring possession of conscious and extensive knowledge of a language without being consciously aware of the rules of the language acquired. The latter refers to conscious knowledge of a second language, knowing the rules, being aware of them and being able to talk about them. This conscious learning activates the Monitor (a mental editor to correct errors) in the output either before the sentence is uttered or written, or after it. The relevant point in learning is that the conscious learning does not initiate utterances. That is why learning does not turn into acquisition.

Nonetheless, teaching is the most relevant influence on either acquiring or learning. Although this work focuses on learning rather than teaching, it is appropriate to say that the influence teaching has on the learning process determines the success or failure of the learner. The method English knowledge is given or instructed to the learner emphasizes the learner process, the language skills, the class activities, and the process-oriented view of language (Lewis 1993). Whatever methodology, input is the key to connect teaching and learning, since the productive skills emerge from it. This work does not focus on writing either, but on speaking, because language that is written differs from that that is spoken (Lewis 1993). In order to see the Spanish lexical influence on English language learning process, speaking will offer more evidence of lexicon participation due to the use of

words happens as they are orally produced, while, through writing, the production occurs most likely mentally.

There are also some particular communicative aspects that are present in either process, such as input, contextual variability, output and the role of lexicon. Among them, input is the first and most important since it is what the acquirer needs, initially to understand and then to produce communication; even though, it can vary according to the context and the linguistic and extra linguistic information of the situation from which it emerges (Krashen 1987). Input must be interesting and/or relevant for the students in both cases, so that they may even forget that the message is encoded in a foreign language. In this way, communication will be successful and actual knowledge plus more vocabulary, that is provided automatically, will mean more comprehension. On the contrary, when input is not clear for the acquirer, it can become noise and will obviously not promote acquisition. As a result of this, the learner will be led, in accordance with Krashen's input theory (1987), into either of these circumstances: he will use slower and unclear articulation, as well as shorter sentences. It means that he will need more processing time and will have less use of high frequency vocabulary; in addition, the learner will not truly feel ready to speak and will fall back on his first language rules and vocabulary by using them in the second language as a pattern to make his utterances.

Previous characteristics of input show that any learner understands first, afterwards, it helps him to learn a language; however, understanding comes after comprehending the words used in any conversation. Rod Ellis (1987) explains that these words can be expressed at different levels such as phonological, grammatical and lexical; and, any modification in the learner's talk is made for the purpose of communication. This happens because the learner performs differently in different occasions. Therefore, it is the actual situation in which the communication event takes place that conveys judgments about which words to use and how to express them. In sum, the communicative event is conditioned by

to whom the learner is speaking, where and when he is speaking, why he is speaking, about what he is speaking and how he wants to say it. This entire situation is called contextual variability. As explained before, it deals with the different learner's performance of a language that is used on singular contexts.

Moreover, Ellis defines context in accordance with two different qualities. First, the context can refer to the situation in which the utterance is produced, this means the situational context. Second, it can refer to the linguistic environment, the surrounding language, this means the linguistic context. These two situations are simply named *context* and *co-text*, respectively, by Lewis in his presentation of The Lexical Approach (1993). In particular, context and co-text influence on the choice of language forms and therefore have an effect on output; but, the co-text has a more central importance in language learning as it permits the learner to note the situation in which the word may occur.

Thus, another aspect that plays a meaningful role in the process of acquiring a new language is output. According to Stephen Krashen (1987), output contribution affects the quantity and quality of the kind of input that is addressed to the acquirer. In consequence, a learner does not acquire spoken fluency just by practicing talking, but by understanding input (it comes from two sources, mainly listening, and reading). The goal of EFL students producing an accurate and comprehensible output is directly related to the input quality and its understanding. It would not be possible for any learner to get a fluent and coherent use of a second language, even when the time of practice is long, if the sources used for basing the output production have not been emphatically clarified. It means that acquisition does not depend strictly on the role of output, but it is also tied to a clean and high quality of input. In this way, output just aids learning because it provides a domain for error correction, but it does not clearly determine how much of the second language has been acquired by the learner.

After having explained input, output and the contextual variability, it is time to make clear the role of lexicon. Most of the time lexicon is misunderstood as vocabulary, even as grammar (Lewis 1993). In his book, he clearly defines lexicon as each minimal unit for certain syntactic or analytical purposes; so, that minimal unit can be either a phoneme, or a word, or polywords, or phrasal constrains, or locutions, or utterances, or entire texts. On the contrary, vocabulary is words, with collocational range, which can be fitted in sentence frames, that is, structures, sentence patterns, verb forms, etc. All these generative bits of the language are what Lewis names grammar. Accordingly, the role of lexicon in the language learning process is to make meaning, to create relationship with reality. But this is not done by words within a sentence; meaning is done by defining and excluding the differences between terms. Therefore, language is distinctions among linguistic units with relational identity to give meaning.

## **2.2 L1 and L2 Learning Process**

In this part, the development of L1 acquisition will be described in the main characteristics to compare it to L2 learning process. The comparison is due since the study of L1 acquisition process comes in the similar perspective of the evidence about L2 language acquiring sequences (Littlewood 1998), and, it has served as a backcloth for understanding L2 learning process.

The study of L1 acquisition started being theorized in the middle of twentieth century by the behaviorist approach to language and learning. This habit-formation process had a sequence of imitation, reinforcement, repetition, and a conditioned verbal behavior as a final result. The mistakes in the child's utterances were seen as the result of imperfect learning (Skinner 1957). This learning theory was applicable to all forms of learning as it gave rise to two classroom strategies: successful performance encourages future successful performance; and, incorrect performance should be avoided (Lewis 1993). This premise had a great influence on language teaching in the 1950's.

Afterwards, by the 1960's, especially under the influence of Noam Chomsky's linguistic theories and cognitive psychology, the inadequacies of the behaviorist approach were challenged. The critics claimed that language is not merely "verbal behavior" but a complex system of rules, since speakers are able to create and understand an infinite number of sentences from the universal features: these are contained in the Language Acquisition Device (Littlewood 1998). This creative ability to construct grammatical relationships enables the learner to perceive the world in terms of the agents and objects of actions. This shows that L1 learning may be partly a result of general cognitive capacities and partly a result of specific language-processing mechanisms.

### 2.2.1 L1 Grammatical System Development

Since the 1960's, the studies examined children's language from its own underlying system. This perspective shows how children develop their grammatical system until it corresponds, eventually, to that of the adult community. On this way, this development has three main stages:

The *telegraphic speech* which consists of one-word utterances, and, in which the situation plays an important role in conveying the meaning since words can have a different meaning in a different situation. On this stage, the child is already making use of an ability to combine items from a limited set as a purpose to communicate meanings.

The second stage extends the telegraphic speech to the *development of inflections and function words*, it means, sentences with more words plus articles and prepositions. Over here, the mastering of inflections comes gradually, over certain periods of time, evidencing that the learner starts being an active contributor to the acquisition process.

Extensively, the last stage is the development of *transformations* in which there are sentence-structured combinations, such as, negatives, interrogatives and complex grammatical utterances.

In his book, Littlewood (1998) states that, even though there is not sufficient evidence to determine how the learner passes through these stages, it is clear that acquisition is a process of growing competence in grammatical development and an increasing performance in this capacity. In Krashen's words (1987), this growing competence is mainly the result of input due to it generates output, so, the amount of input improves the quality of output, in consequence, acquisition. This is the reason why output is not the influent factor to demonstrate acquisition in early learners.

However, in the grammatical system development and its stages, there are other two factors that contribute in L1 language acquisition. Mostly, they state the social significance of utterances. In the first place, the cognitive factors, like the relation between language and concepts (the meanings and distinctions of the world from language use), and the language-learning mechanisms indicate how the learner makes sense of the linguistic system in function to communicate meanings. In the second place, the language environment, in which the child creates the language to model and in which learning takes place, stimulates L1 learning process while provides the material on which the process operates.

On its own, L1 grammatical system development, taken from children's language form, marks that the final purpose of learning a language is to have distinction of the definite function in communicating meaning, and, to reach this purpose, the learner firstly goes through a one-word speech, secondly through inflections, and finally elaborates complex utterances that agree with the social significance of the adult world.

### 2.2.2 L2 Learning Process

The comparison between L1 acquisition and L2 learning process can start in the cognitive factors described above, especially, in the relation between language and concepts. This match remains of major importance since the second language to learn will sometimes require the learner to develop consciousness of new concepts and distinctions (Littlewood 1998). It obviously means that the learner must have L1 concepts clearly acquired and underlined in order to develop L2 concepts with a sense of a new linguistic system.

Nonetheless, the development of L2 distinctions causes a complicated factor: when learning a L1, the acquirer is a novice indeed; but, when learning a L2, the learner already possesses a set of linguistic habits from L1 that are frequently used for learning the L2. Susan Gass and Jacquelyn Schachter (1989) claim that the difficulty that can emerge by trying to develop the new linguistic system is that L2 learners treat the second language like their mother tongue. Under this perspective, there are two possibilities to develop the new linguistic system, either by interpreting L2 into L1 structure or by imposing a superset of lexical parameters. With this perception, interpreting L2 into L1 structure is done by understanding the L2 statements after having contrasted them into L1 interpretation; however, when L2 and L1 do not match, the learner must construct a new assignment into L2 to interpret and produce the L2 structure. For the second possibility, imposing a superset of lexical parameters is done by a deductive process of interpretation of concepts; in this stage, if a word in L2 matches with one in L1, the acquisition of that word is facilitated; if not, the learner must assign a new value for that concept from a number of his semantic units of meaning.

Littlewood (1998) summarizes these two situations by using the terms of transfer and interference from the behaviorist perspective. When L1 structure fits L2 one, it is called positive transfer; when L1 structure does not fit L2 one, it is called interference or negative transfer. This second situation is what causes high or low



difficulties and errors when developing the new linguistic system. Those levels of difficulty in L2 learning process are conditioned by the comparison from acquired L1 linguistic choices to L2 ones. For a L2 learner, it is easier to learn a structure or pattern that has no equivalent from L1 to L2, just because it does not produce interference. The difficulty then emerges when there is a structure that has equivalent form L1 to L2. If this is the case, the equivalent structures will cause confusion and interference which are noticeable with errors in the learner's speech. Later, interference will be explained deeply in the brief enlightenment of Krashen's L2 acquisition theory.

### **2.2.3 Systematic Errors as Strategies for L2 Learning**

Littlewood continues affirming that errors in the learner's utterances have been seen as a faulty version of L2 since the 1960's. Nevertheless, this is not totally true because the learner's errors are examples of cognitive strategies for constructing the L2 linguistic system; this development is done by gradually adapting L2 data they encounter in the system they are learning.

Another factor that is worth taking into account about errors is that it is wrong to see them as a simple result of transferring, or what is called interlingual errors. In fact, there is another category: intralingual errors, which show that the learner is processing the L2 into his/her own terms. By looking at the two kinds of errors, there is evidence of three main strategies the learner applies to learn the L2, the first refers to interlingual errors and the other two to intralingual errors.

The most common interlingual error is *transfer of rules*. In it, the learner uses what he already knows about language, say, he uses his previous L1 knowledge as a means of organizing L2 data just because L1 provides language hypothesis to understand L2, so the learner does not have to discover L2 structure from zero language knowledge. As seen, this process results economical and productive for the L2 learner because there could be similarities between the two languages.

Meaningfully, transfer errors seem to be more frequent with beginners than with intermediate students just because beginners tend to use more L1 for organizing L2 data. As a result of this, if L1 and L2 structure fit each other, the hypothesis of that fitness is confirmed and then, it is used in similar situations though it is not corresponded. However, some transfer errors will probably never disappear entirely as the learner progresses in L2. Therefore, it might be said that from transfer errors, that are unconsciously produced, surge another error, it is *fossilization*. It means that transfer errors become permanent features of the learner's speech in spite of the fact the learner can almost certainly know he is committing such errors, but he detects them just after he has made them.

Apart from interlingual errors, the most common intralingual error is *overgeneralization*. It occurs when the L2 learner allocates one specific rule to more categories than it covers. The process is broken into two particular situations: when the assignation of the rule does not fit one item, the learner creates an exception of the general rule; and, when the assignation belongs to another item, the learner constructs a new category and rule for that assignation.

The opposite to overgeneralization is *simplification by omission*. It emerges when the learner reduces either one specific rule to all the categories in which it can be used or eliminates some items to convey the intended message. This process occurs due more to the learner's L2 linguistic limitations than to his capacity of constructing L2 rules.

#### **2.2.4 Non-systematic errors. More Strategies for L2 Learning**

Thus far, we have seen errors in L2 learning process since the cognitive development of rules for the new linguistic system. But it is worth pointing out that the L2 learning process is not only noticeable in the process of acquiring L2 rules, L2 learners can also make errors which do not result from the development of a new linguistic system, but from more superficial influences (Littlewood 1998).

These ones emerge from the immediate communication strategies and from the performance factors.

When the learner wants to express a meaning for which his L2 linguistic competence does not contain enough rules, he tries to match language items (like gestures, omission by unknown, L1 resources) to the situation in order to solve his communication problem. This is what is called *communication strategies*, a process when the learner knows he is committing an error, but, however, he uses it for communicative strategy because he does not have any another reference to convey the meaning.

Another strategy is the *performance errors*. It occurs when the learner is speaking and he loses track of the complex structure that was conveying the meaning. What is considered an error here is just a communication strategy just because the error does not come from the development of the new linguistic system, but from the situation in which the learner's performance occurs. These "errors" are slips of the tongue, unfinished and abandoned utterances, and track losing of meanings.

### **2.2.5 L2 Grammatical System Development**

So far, just errors when learning a L2 have been described. The purpose of this description is to understand that errors themselves are the product of learning; thus, they are strategies in which the learner supports to understand the L2 linguistic system. However, the use or not of one of these strategies may be determined by the L2 grammatical system development. This L2 learning sequence may not differ from L1 sequence in spite of the fact that L1 acquiring system occurs in an environment where the language to acquire is given in real-life situations (Littlewood 1998). Therefore, when a language is required to be used in real-life situations, there is a need to use it for communication; so, there is a natural stimulus to learn that language. It might probably be more difficult for a L2 learner to acquire the target language if there are not real-life situations to use L2 for

communication. For this condition, “the classroom is what must substitute the outside world and bring the learners to the point they can begin to understand real L2 language by making the student conversationally competent.” (Krashen 1987)

When it is said that the classroom is the fictitious environment in where learners understand the target language, it is necessary to see this place with all its components, say, teachers, classmates, material, atmosphere, teaching methods and teaching grammar sequences. All these parts work together to present L2 to the learner from the basic structures to the complex ones. This is the reason why L1 acquiring process is quite similar to L2 one. As it was explained before, the process of language learning is determined by a linguistic system development, being affected by the social significance of language and the learner’s cognitive factors. This is the role the classroom plays on the learner’s L2 learning process. Now, we will see how L2 grammatical system development resembles L1 one by taking into account Littlewood’s viewpoint.

### **2.2.6 L2 Grammatical Sequences**

In 2.2.1 we saw that the L1 grammatical system development had three main stages: the telegraphic speech which consists of one-word utterances, the development of inflections which is an extension of the telegraphic speech, and the development of transformations which refers to more sentence structured combinations in the learner’s speech. For the L2 grammatical sequences, there are four stages whose contents do not go far away from the L1 four stages:

#### ***The Grammatical Morphemes***

Words are learnt in a fictitious sequence by using them for expressing meaning in accordance more with teaching language manipulation rather than communication. The L2 word acquisition order shows the frequency with which each word occurs in the speech of an L2 learner, and how important those words are to the

communication of meaning. In addition, L2 word acquisition order is determined by two more factors: partly by his L1 knowledge, when the learner needs transfer to broad his basic stock of L2 vocabulary; and partly by independent aspects of his mother tongue, when a word that has not yet been taught is necessary to convey meaning.

Here, it is possible to see how L1 acquisition is very alike to L2 acquisition: the primary words the learner acquires are determined by the social context and the instruction of the tutors. So that, the learner assimilates what is given and then uses it to communicate.

### ***Learning to form negatives***

Contrary to L1 acquiring process, the L2 learning of negatives comes with formal instruction. It is a process that contains in itself four stages: The first is when the L2 learner places the negative element (“no”) within a simple sentence; the second when the negative element is dominated by auxiliaries with no variation from the first stage; the third when the negative element is placed with variation of the auxiliary; and the fourth when the negative element performs its full functions as a marker of tenses and subjects.

In learning to form negatives there is a similarity to L1 acquiring process: in spite of the fact it is not given with formal instruction, the L1 learner commonly tends to allocate the negative element within the position it gives more sense to the meaning. After some practice, he reaches the point in which he puts the negative element within the correct place.

### ***Learning to form questions***

It is a parallel process to the way the learner forms negatives. Firstly, he makes questions with the minimum disturbance of the basic sentence structure. Secondly,

the inversion takes place with fixed phrases; it permits the learner to reach, thirdly, a spread use of inversions. This instructed process is not obviously learnt at once, it is required of a productive practice to control the structure.

Comparatively, this process differs from L1 acquiring only in the way it is taught. L1 learners acquire the question structure through interaction and modeling of the adult language. On the contrary, L2 learners find proficiency through constant instruction and correction, particularly from the teacher.

### ***Learning the basic sentence pattern***

It starts from the basic phased sentences and then it expands in length. The success of this development resides in two aspects: a well-learned sentence structure sequence, and a memorized repertoire. They will permit the learner to produce a sentence as a single unit in situations which call for it as well as a sentence from his creative rules allowing him to use his prefabricated pattern. In addition, the social contact with the L2 will permit the learner to give different intonation to his utterance. It is done thanks to imitation, memorization and practice.

This stage does not go far from the L1 learning process. We can compare it to the L1 stage of inflections in the first term and to the L1 stage of transformations at the final term. As explained before, inflections deal with the use of more words in the learner's utterances and, transformations with the performance of complete sentences by giving them meaning and social acceptance.

As it has been explained thus far, L1 acquiring process is alike to L2 learning process since learners try to follow the same sequences to internalize the target language. However, as Littlewood claims, the processes must not be generalized as they might have variations in accordance with learner's mother tongue, age, and instruction. Added together, L1 acquiring process and L2 learning process carry

out the similar development if cognitive factors and social situations are taken into account. For both processes, errors are signs of learning strategies whose ways of correcting them vary instructionally and situationally from L1 to L2.

### **2.3. L1 Influences on L2 Learning Process**

In this section, we include the main aspects of Krashen's theory (1988) about L2 learning process. The purpose of this description is to see the five hypothesis of this theory, so that the L1 influence according to Krashen's viewpoint will be more understandable. However, the central point is the Susan Gass' perspective (1989) of L1 interference in L2 learning process, since this author better explains the logical problems of EFL learning process.

To explain about L1 influences on L2 learning process, it is necessary to take into account the characteristics of such processes and the factors affecting L1 (child language acquisition) and L2 (Foreign language learning process) language acquisition. This characterization of adults' L2 learning process includes, when it is possible, a comparative representation of what happens in the same aspect but in child's language development.

#### **2.3.1 Characteristics of Second Language Acquisition**

-Lack of Success: Normal children inevitably achieve perfect mastery of the languages, adult foreign language learners do not. Any model that entails uniform success -as child language acquisition models must be- is a failure. It is a model of adult language learning. This is a serious obstacle to the view that the same process underlies child and adult's L2 acquisition. (Dulay, Burt and Krashen 1982) Success in acquiring a new language and its vocabulary depends on the capability of characterizing cross-linguistic differences in the meaning of words from a psychologically insightful way.

-General Failure: Not only is success in L2 learning not guaranteed, but also complete success is extremely rare, or perhaps even nonexistent. Language is not merely difficult to learn with only general cognitive strategies, it is virtually impossible. This is one important reason for attributing children with an innate domain-specific language faculty.

- Variation in Success, Course and Strategy: There is substantial variation in degree of success among adults, even when age, language exposure, and instruction remain constant. Different learners also follow different paths and no one could generalize a strategy when results and degrees of attainment tend to be different as well.

-Fossilization: It is noticeable that foreign language learners reach a certain stage of learning and then permanently stabilize at this stage, learning development ceases and even serious conscious efforts to change are often fruitless (Selinker 1972). Fossilization does not occur in children, their learning stages are inevitably passing through; the system remains plastic until they reach success.

-Indeterminate Intuitions: The knowledge underlying non-native speaker performance may be incomplete; some scholars have called this kind of grammatically judgments as *indeterminate*. A non-native system may be for example in part a relatively heterogeneous collection of strategies for achieving communicative goals: a system of rules generating only all the sequences of a language may be absent.

-Importance of Instruction: Children do not require organized formal lessons to learn a language or at least it is debatable how much deliberate shaping the average child receives. However, a whole industry has built the consensus that instruction matters in L2 learning, such as materials, seem to show that instruction does aid foreign language learning and accomplish an important function in adult skill acquisition.



-Negative Evidence: Child language acquisition seems not to use – and surely does not rely upon – any consistent source of negative evidence. Among teachers and learners of foreign languages, there is a general agreement that negative evidence is at least some times useful and necessary when some of the errors of foreign language learners suggest that the whole hypothesis requires negative evidence for disconfirmation.

-Role of Affective Factors: Success in child's language development seems unaffected by personality, socialization, motivation attitude, or the like. It strongly contrasts with the case of general adult skill acquisition that is highly susceptible to such affective factors.

These general characteristics of foreign language learning tend to lead to the conclusion that domain (children's specific language acquisition system) ceases to operate in adults. It would be the correct conclusion if it were not for the fact that the adult possesses other knowledge and faculties that are absent in the infant, like the domain of at least one language. Then, the problem of language acquisition becomes that one of explaining the quite high level of competence that is possible in some cases. Thus, the nature of the differences between L1 and L2 learning processes is internal, linguistic and qualitative. It is internal when It is caused by differences in the internal cognitive state of adults versus children rather than by some external factors (Insufficient input for example). Linguistic when It is caused specifically by a change in the language faculty rather than by some general change in learning ability. And qualitative when the difference is not merely quantitative; the domain-specific acquisition system is not just attenuated, it is unavailable.

Therefore, the child learner possesses firstly a definition of possible grammar, it means a universal grammar; secondly, a means of arriving at a grammar by basing his/her knowledge on available data: a learner's procedure or sets of procedures.

Even supposing that the original scheme of universal grammar is no longer working in adults, the foreign learner can certainly reconstruct much of it by observing the native language. However, any L2 learner may presume that certain features of the native language are universal, what might cause errors in communication. For adult learners, the previous knowledge of his/her mother tongue and the general cognitive ability to deal with abstract and formal systems are able to compensate, approximately but not perfectly, the loss of the child's knowledge of universal grammar.

In summary, the knowledge of the native language, taken in child L1 development by the assumption of an innate universal grammar, is what gives success in foreign language learning.

### **2.3.2 Factors affecting second Language Learning**

-Interference: The basic problems of foreign language learning arise not out of any essential difficulty in the features of the new language themselves, but primarily out of the special set created by the first language habits (Charles C Fries, in his foreword to Robert Lado's *Contrastive Analysis Textbook* [1957]). Even though this hypothesis does not explain why a third language should often seem to be less difficult than a second, the proven capacity of human beings to replace old habits for new ones has made this view of language universally rejected.

-Input: Many adults, trying to learn a foreign language, are obviously exposed to much less language input than the average child, this difference is often compounded by the fact that teachers may not themselves speak well, and may give imperfect lessons, that is why a general deficiency of input could explain many cases of adult language errors. However, the cases which adults fail to attain native speaker competence even after decades of residence among native speakers are very particular; the total amount of comprehensible input in this case must surely equal or even exceed that of the three-year-old child.

-Affect: Factors as motivation, attitude, self-image, ego and so forth seem to influence adult language learning very much. For example, Heyde (1983) shows a correlation between self-esteem and language proficiency: do all children have the same self-esteem? Naiman et al. (1978) report, in a general study of what makes a good language learner, an apparent lack of self-confidence among less successful second language learners. They also said that learners of French who enthusiastically raise their hands to volunteer also tend to do well on proficiency tests. On the contrary, the poorest performers do not like to participate in class and are embarrassed when required to speak French. This is not surprising by assuming that people like to do what they are good at and they feel better about themselves if they succeed.

Conversely, in many foreign language-learning studies that purport to zero in the affective factors, it seems just as likely that the affective variable is the result of proficiency rather than the cause. Anyway, these ideas appear still to be nebulous to bear scrutiny.

-Competing Cognitive Systems: We can argue that a Language-Specific Cognitive System (LSC) allows the child to come up with the formal properties of language, even though formal systems in general are beyond the child. This LSC is the only module capable of dealing with language in young children.

Alternatively, humans develop a general ability to deal with abstract formal systems around puberty. This system is identified with the onset of Piaget's formal operations (Felix 1980) of the Problem-Solving Cognitive System (PSC). Therefore, the adolescent has two ways to approach to the processes of language data; even though, the PSC, unlike the LSC, is not particularly well equipped to deal with language acquisition while insuppressibly at language learning. Thus, variation may perhaps attribute success in which the PSC ought to inhibit natural language acquisition. A weak PSC ought to facilitate it, but it is highly unlikely that an existing

cognitive system, designed perfectly for a specific task, should then be somehow blocked by a later arising system. It is not impossible that a situation like that could happen in evolution, but it seems unlikely. On the other hand, if the LSC continues to be available and in good shape, it is difficult to see why it would not process linguistic data as it is designed to.

We can conclude, from the data collected on this section, that linguistic theory and cognitive psychology have made great strides in explaining some of the mysteries of child language development. This is precisely what enables the mysteries of adult language learning to be investigated from a new perspective in which we can know what evidence is relevant.

### **2.3.3 Explanation of Krashen's L2 Acquisition theory**

Krashen's theory posits that language acquisition occurs when language is used for what it was designed for: communication. He also affirms that a real language acquisition develops slowly for speaking skills emerge later than listening skills, even when conditions are perfect.

The best methods for developing language acquisition are those that supply "comprehensible input", and allow students to produce utterances when they feel ready to do so. The fact of recognizing that improvement comes from supplying communicative and comprehensible input and not from forcing and correcting production.

According to Krashen's theory, there are five hypotheses about second language acquisition. The first three ones are the acquisition-learning distinction, the natural order hypothesis, and the monitor hypothesis. The fourth one is the input hypothesis which is the most important premise in his theory just because it tends to answer the crucial question of how we acquire language. The last one is the

affective filter hypothesis. As follows, a brief summary of each hypothesis is presented.

The acquisition-learning premise makes a distinction between language acquisition and language learning process. One differs from the other because acquisition is a subconscious process in which language acquirers are not aware of the fact that they are acquiring language, while language learning is the conscious knowledge of a second language, that is, knowing the rules and being able to talk about them. In this hypothesis, the process of acquiring L2 is similar to the way children acquire their first language. Krashen describes acquisition process as “picking up the language.”

The second is the Natural Order Hypothesis which claims that acquirers of a target language tend to acquire certain grammatical structures earlier than others.

The Monitor Hypothesis gives a specific function to acquisition and learning processes. Acquisition initiates our utterances in a second language and is responsible for our fluency. Learning works as a monitor or editor and comes into play only to make changes in the form of our utterances, after they have been produced by the acquired system. Conscious learning then allows performers to use the target language rules only when three conditions are fulfilled: time (a performer needs to think about and use the rules), focus on form (a performer needs to think about correctness to attend the way of speaking), and knowledge of the rule. Therefore, the use of monitor probably makes the performer supply his utterances with items that are not yet acquired.

This monitor hypothesis suggests three types of performers: first, the monitor over-users who simply do not trust they have already acquired some competence and only feel secure when they refer to their monitor. Second, the monitor under-users who prefer not to use their conscious knowledge, even when conditions allow it; they are always influenced by error correction. The last performer is the optimal

monitor user, they use the monitor when it is appropriate, and when it does not interfere with communication. In sum, the three monitor users can use their *learned competence* as a supplement to their *acquired competence*.

The fourth proposition is the Input Hypothesis. It claims that acquisition is done by understanding the language and “going for meaning”, not by focusing on the form of the messages. It also states that a fitted condition to acquire L2, necessary to move from stage  $i$  to stage  $i+1$  in L2 acquisition process, is when the acquirer understands input that contains  $i+1$ . In other words, the acquirer understands language that contains structures a little beyond where he is. In addition, acquirers do not only use their linguistic competence to understand L2, but also their knowledge of the world and their extra-linguistic information.

The input hypothesis opposes to the traditional methods in which acquirers first learn grammatical structures, afterwards practice communication by using them in order to develop fluency. It illustrates that acquirers firstly understand L2 then, as a result of this, fluency can be developed. This is the reason why speaking fluently can not be taught directly, it emerges over the time. Thus, the best way to teach speaking is simply to provide comprehensible input in order to allow acquirer to speak when he feels ready.

Another important aspect with which the input hypothesis deals is the modified input used for aiding comprehension. There are three sorts of modified input: foreigner-talk, the modifications native speakers make with less competent speakers of their language; teacher-talk, the foreigner-modified-input talk in the classroom; and finally, interlanguage-talk, the speech of other second language acquirers. Among them, the teacher-talk is the most relevant in the L2 acquiring process since it is compared to the way parents talk to their children when they are acquiring their first language. This type of speech, that is called “caretaker speech”, makes teachers modify their speech in a simpler way to help their students understand the language. These modifications are made for the purpose of

communication and for helping the second language acquirers to understand what is being said. in brief, the caretaker speech has to do with the “here and now” and with everything a child can perceive in their immediate environment; however, in the classroom, the teacher-talk is not always in the “here and now”, teachers make input comprehensible by taking advantage of the acquirer’s knowledge of the world, which is greater than that of the child’s when acquiring a first language.

When second language acquirers are in the process of building up competence in the target language by understanding and listening, there is an important phase defined as the silent period. It is more noticeable in children; they can say very little for several months attending that is the first exposure to the second language. This happens because speaking ability emerges on its own, after enough competence has been developed.

The last hypothesis is the Affective Filter hypothesis. It states how a variety of affective variables relate to success in language acquisition. The variables are motivation, self-confidence and anxiety. The performers with high motivation, good self-image and low anxiety, whether measured as personal or classroom anxiety, tend to do better in language acquisition. These acquirers vary with respect to the strength or level of their affective filter. Those whose attitudes are not optimal for L2 acquisition, will not only obtain insufficient input, but also have a strong affective filter, which is not going to allow input reach that part of the brain responsible for language acquisition. On the contrary, those whose attitudes are more conducive to L2 acquisition will not only seek and obtain more input; but also have a lower or weaker affective filter.

The affective filter hypothesis also defines the language teacher as someone who can provide input and help make it comprehensible in a low anxiety situation. These two roles are the true causative variables of second language acquisition.

To summarize Krashen's second language acquisition theory, three principles can be stated: acquisition is more important than learning; comprehensible input containing  $i+1$  (structures a bit beyond the acquirer's current level) is necessary for acquiring L2; and the low or weak affective filter allows that input "in".

### **2.3.4 L1 interference in Krashen's theory**

As it was demonstrated above, input hypothesis is the most relevant in concern to L1 influence. Adult and child L2 learners are often not allowed a silent period, they are asked to produce in the second language before they have acquired enough competence to express their ideas. In accordance with this hypothesis, performers who are asked to produce earlier, will fall back on first language rules, that is, they will use syntactic rules of their L1 while speaking the L2.

When the acquirer substitutes L1 rules for L2 rules, these are generally different each one from the other, the resulting error an acquirer commits is known as "interference". This interference is the result of the lack of acquisition of L2 rules that are needed in performance. The solution Krashen proposes is simply to provide the acquirer with comprehensible input in order to cure that ignorance, avoiding drill at the point of contrast between the two languages.

### **2.3.5 Age as a variable in L2 Acquisition Krashen's theory**

Among several factors describing success in second language acquisition, Krashen argues that the learner's age, as it has been popularly assumed, is a predictor of second language proficiency; as a result, adults tend to learn a L2 but not to acquire it. The fact is that adults can really acquire since the ability to pick up languages does not disappear at puberty. This means that adults can access the same natural "language acquisition device" that children use. Besides, age itself is not directly responsible for the second language acquirer's attainments. Everything



is reduced down to the quantity of comprehensible input and the level of affective filter.

In a review of the available empirical research on the effect of age in second language acquisition, Krashen found three consistent generalizations. First, adults proceed through the early stages of second language development faster than children do. Second, older children acquire faster than younger children when time and exposure were held constant. Third, acquirers who begin natural exposure to L2 during childhood generally achieve higher second language proficiency than those beginning as adults.

He finally concludes that these generalizations are reduced to adults and older children's ability to obtain comprehensible input. Thus, comprehensible input is hypothesized to be the causative variable for language acquisition instead of age.

#### **2.4. L1 Lexicon Influence on L2 Learning Process**

Among the various lines of inquiry in second language learning research, there are a number of questions which are of central importance; one of them concerns the influence of first language lexicon on the L2 learning developmental stages. The literature about lexical development in second language learning is focused without reference on a formal theory of lexicon.

For instance, Katz (1975) develops a theory closely related to the goals of transformational grammar. He regards word meaning as represented in a world's internal structure: the meaning of a word is built up from a number of semantic primitives, or basic units of meaning. Under this view, the process involved in acquiring word meaning consists of a direct mapping between semantic primitives, drawn from a universal store, rather than a particular word in a given language.

W. V Quine (1959) rejects this notion explaining that we attribute meanings due to our beliefs about the words and not because of an inherent property of them.

On the contrary, Putnam (1975) declares that words we use refer to the objects in the world; those are the world's extension. For illustration, a world like "gold" rigidly designates what ever is gold; although there are certain members of our society who know the recognition procedures for determining what "gold" is and we inherit the ability of these experts to determine the extension of the word. This is what Putnam calls the division of linguistic labor, it allows the reversibility of words meaning as scientific discovery dictates. For each word we acquire we have a stereotype in varying depth and detail, Stereotypes are not linguistic entities but conventional ideas that constitute our own form of description. Putnam also includes cultural factors as the ones that determine, to a large extent, the way we come to acquire words. The nature of the required minimum level of competence depends heavily upon both, culture and the topic.

The approach to lexical meaning presented by Jackendoff's *Semantics and Cognition* (1983) claims that there is a level of mental representation at which linguistic, sensory and motor information are compatible and subjective to the same kind of rules. She concludes that since perception of things is the result of certain information the mind supplies, linguistic expressions are the resulting mental entities that are projected onto our awareness, not onto the real world objects themselves. Then, while we are conscious of the information encoded under a word, the principles that organize this information act subconsciously and are not usually retrievable.

However, the applicability of these theories to second language acquisition research needs to be demonstrated.

One of the most common concerns in the L2 literature on the lexicon is that learners initially approach the learning of words as a translation process

(Schumann 1982). This assertion demonstrates the Byzantium dilemma of L2 learners come to employ the same process in learning L2 as they do in L1. This is seen as the gradual progression of more accurate hypothesis resulting from massive exposure to language in context. They develop by taking into account that one may use apparently the same word in both languages; however, it is necessary to consider that in some ways they can be different. Besides, it is not possible to build a stable complex of information within a lexical entry from a limited number of examples of the thing a word refers.

Therefore, a theory of the acquisition of word meaning relies crucially on the proper characterization of the nature of word meaning. That is, if the learner does not understand what the word means; the possibility to acquire it is minimal. At this point, we return to Krahen's meaningful and comprehensible input. But, it now becomes necessary to establish when input turns into intake in order to see why L2 learners use some lexical items more than others.

### **The Lexical Approach**

Michael Lewis (1993) clearly differentiates input, as the language presented to learners through the receptive skills, from intake, as the language learners benefit from and is able to integrate either partially or totally into their repertoire. This is the reason why input must be meaningful and comprehensible. However, to know why some words are acquired and some others are not while communicating, a view on conveying meaning must be taken.

In general, lexicon items carry meaning, people use them to express emotion and attitude; as a result, not all lexicon items are equally useful. In selecting which ones to use, several considerations are taken. These reflections define what must be communicated and how. In one word, meaning. The Lexical Approach categorizes it in eight types:

Referential Meaning: it describes the basic meaning of the fact, without interpretation or embellishment.

Differential Meaning: lexical items are defined by contrast with other lexical items rather than by their inherent properties.

Connotational Meaning: when the speaker uses one lexical item rather than another for expressing a referential or additional content.

Contextual Meaning: when some lexical items must be used instead of others due to both the co-text and the context.

Pragmatic Meaning: the listener's interpretation of the speaker's purpose.

Discourse Meaning: the meaning of a full lexical item depending upon the words it is composed of for effective communication.

Factual Meaning: the degree of validity attributed to the statement by the speaker.

Negotiated Meaning: it is the negotiation of meaning that is created by the interaction of one language user with the other.

Nonetheless, meaning itself would not be understood if not by the nature of lexical items. In the Basic Concepts in the beginning of this Theoretical Framework, the difference between lexicon and vocabulary was made. As a reminder, lexicon is each minimal unit for certain syntactic or analytical purposes when communicating. At this time, the different kinds of lexicon items must be clarified.

As language is a social phenomenon and every language has propositional content, lexical items are as well socially sanctioned independent units. Each of those units can be composed of:

Words: the basic kind of lexical item. They are concerned with selecting and sequencing the range and frequency of occurrence of terms (*With, book, of, etc.*)

Multi-word items: These are units composed of several words but recognized as having an independent existence in spite of their components (*Bless you! I'm afraid... etc.*)

Polywords: they are usually relatively short, but their whole meaning is apparently totally different from the components (*On one hand, at random, put off, etc.*)

Collocations: they refer to the way individual words or phrases exclusively go with other particular words in a way they sound correct (*Rancid butter, hard frost, etc.*)

Institutionalized Expressions: these ones permit the language user to manage aspects of interaction in a pragmatic way (*Not yet, I think so, Sorry to interrupt, etc.*)

In accordance with the categorization of meaning and lexical items, the Lexical Approach has positive suggestions to make about the nature and role of lexis. It suggests that increasing competence and communicative power are achieved by extending the students' repertoire of lexical items, and by increasing mastery of the most basic words and structures of the language. As explained before, the Lexical approach recognizes meaning as central to language, and choice as the basis of meaning. The origin of that meaning is the lexical items since words carry more meaning than grammar as well as express intentions and not uses. This is why many superficially grammatical errors are caused by lexical deficiency.

## 2.5 English Language Teaching Methods and Approaches

In sections 2 and 3, the basic terminology to understand language learning and its respective processes have been explained. Next, it has been concluded that the L2 learning process can vary in accordance with, among other factors, instruction. This one offers the learner the quality of input in order to get meaningful output, while can be influenced by the classroom atmosphere. As a result of this, it is necessary to examine some L2 teaching alternatives, in which L1 tends to be used, to understand both the extension in which Spanish lexicon influences on L2 learning and how input is given the learner to reach the point of learning. Therefore, in this section, we will see some methods and relevant present-day teaching approaches, only since the input provision and L1 participation, by highlighting the role of grammar, lexicon and practice; so that the focus of L1 influences on L2 learning process will be further narrowed.

Before, it is necessary to use precise terminology to clarify the ground about what a method and an approach are. The former explains how the teaching is to be conducted and must not be misunderstood with syllabus that exclusively defines the content of the teaching program (Lewis 1993). The latter is “an integrated set of theoretical and practical beliefs of the nature of language itself and the nature of learning” (Lewis 1993); it also provides principles to decide what kind of content and what sorts of procedures are appropriate in language teaching (Richards & Rodgers 2001). The change from methods to approaches is recognized by the need for nowadays’ viewpoint of speaking proficiency rather than a traditional literary and grammatical appreciation of language as the goal for learning. It means that approaches give emphasis to spoken language (meaningful input) as primary to reach communication, and methods conventionally present language as a set of structures to reach language knowledge rather than speaking.

The characteristics of the following methods and approaches are taken from Stephen Krashen's *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*, and

Jack Richards' *Approaches and Methods in Language teaching* (also his second edition) since these three books show pointedly the role of input in L2 learning process.

### **Grammar Translation Method**

This method usually consists of explanation of grammar rules with complete sentences; vocabulary is presented in the form of a bilingual list; reading exercises emphasizing the rule and vocabulary presented; commonly more written exercises which emphasize control of the structure and memorization of vocabulary. As it is seen, Grammar Translation Method focuses entirely on form instead of the message by its grammatical sequences and literally vocabulary. The grammatical sequence is presented from easy rules to more complex rules while the vocabulary encourages the learner to use his mother tongue. This conscious control of grammar and vocabulary is necessary for mastering the L2; so, the learner is expected to be fully accurate in his utterances by using correctly all the rules all the time. In sum, this method truly promotes the use of L1 for learning L2 by leading the learner to resort to the strategies of positive and negative transfer.

### **Audio-Lingualism Method**

It is based on the behaviorist belief of language learning. Its common features are: grammar is presented with a dialogue; vocabulary and structures are contained in that dialogue; the learner repeats the patterns imitatively until he is able to produce them spontaneously by memorizing them; the exercises are based on substituting words of the pattern automatically to make novel sentences. The frequent use of vocabulary in this method invites the learner to resort to L1 lexicon in order to control L2 pattern of the day. Even though his utterances are expected to be error free, the learner does not focus on the message but on the structure. This situation leads the learner to use his intralingual strategies to scarcely negotiate meaning.

## **Cognitive Code Method**

The goals for this method are: grammar is presented through an explanation of the rule, commonly in the learner's mother tongue; vocabulary is emphasized in all four skills, speaking and listening in addition to reading and writing; exercises are followed by activities which provide practice in meaningful situations. As it is the case of Grammar Translation Method, Cognitive Code focuses more on form than meaning, in spite of the fact that activities try to contextualize the rule of the day in greater quantities. As the learner is expected to produce accurate utterances right away, it disturbs his communication by leading him to fall back on his mother tongue.

## **The Direct Method**

This method instructs learner in the target language. Its characteristics for teaching are: grammar is learnt by inductive teaching; vocabulary remains interesting since the class goes in the mood of a conversation; this mood provides immediate practice of speaking by a sequence of question and answer. Even though this method equips learners with a great amount of comprehensible input, in which the structure is utilized, the conversation is rarely genuine communication. Also, the permanent use of the target language, the strict sequence of grammar, and the accuracy in the learner's utterance cause anxiety and conscious control. This situation promotes the use of all the strategies seen before.

## **Total physical Response Method**

This method usually consists of commands that contextualize various points of grammar, it is neither focused nor sequenced; vocabulary is introduced in every moment from simple to complex commands; the practice starts just when the learner feels ready to start talking, then it goes on with reading and writing. However, listening is activated from the beginning, and learner's acting must show



comprehension of the command. The learner will more probably use overgeneralization and non-systematic rules as soon as he is ready to talk, just because he learns L2 with provided contexts that help him understand L2 sentences uses.

### **Suggestopedia**

This two-part method, which helps the learner to eliminate the psychological barriers to learning, consists of: grammar explanation is given in every class, but apparently, it does not interfere with communication; vocabulary is presented in the traditional way and translation is allowed if necessary; practice comes in a relaxed way in accordance with the learner's needs. The first part deals with one-month intensive instruction via traditional conversations; while, in the second, the central activity is reading with "emotional intonation." The state of relaxation and meditation diminishes the anxiety of using strategies; nevertheless, it does not part the learner with using them.

### **The Natural Approach**

This approach can be described by the following principles: grammar is included in formal exercises and corrected through homework; vocabulary is provided by interesting topics as input for acquisition; the practice enables learners to talk about ideas and solve problems. The focus of this approach is not on grammar, so, there are not sequences of form. On the contrary, the class introduces expressions and sentences for communicative purposes that will help the learner to control the teacher's input. Error correction does not take place in class because students are not compelled to use L2 at once and speaking happens communicatively. This situation diminishes anxiety and leads the learner to resort to L2 previous knowledge to understand and convey meaning.

## **Cooperative Language Teaching**

Olsen and Kagan (1992) explain Cooperative Learning as organized group learning activity, so that learning is dependent on the socially structured exchange of information among learners in groups. Each learner is held accountable for both his own learning and his motivation to increase the other's learning, including those who are academically handicapped.

## **The Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)**

It has its origins in the 70s, when Europe needed a change in its educational realities. By understanding the language as something that carries out the meaning and intention of the speakers, the CLT became an alternative for designing syllabus. Best considered as an approach, the CLT aims to make communicative competence the goal of language teaching, and to develop procedures for the four-language-skill teaching that acknowledges the interdependence of language and communication. Specifically, it claims that language is acquired through communication by "using English to learn it."

The CLT theory of learning has three important principles: communication, the task principle, and the meaningfulness principle. According to this approach, the activities that involve real communication help to develop language, which is meaningful to the learner and supports the learning process. They also address the conditions needed to promote second language learning rather than language acquisition.

Its conception of learning a second language is acquiring the linguistic means to perform different kinds of functions. These functions, the performer has to deal with, are found in Halliday's functional account of language use, described in accordance with the way children acquire their first language. Each one has a different objective of using language: 1) the instrumental function to get things. 2)

The regulatory function to control the behavior of others. 3) The interactional function to create interaction with others. 4) The personal function to express personal feelings and meanings. 5) The heuristic function to learn and to discover. 6) The imaginative function to create a world of the imagination, and 7) the representational function: to communicate information. In sum, the Communicative Language Teaching allows the learner to use the target language as a mean of interaction and communication.

### **Content-Based Instruction**

Krahnke (1987) defines this approach as the teaching of content or information in the language that is being learned, it is done with little or no direct or explicit effort to teach the language itself separated from the content being taught. The subject matter of language teaching is not grammar and functions, but content. As a result, students would learn the language as by-product of learning about real-world content. Its theory of learning states that people learn a second language most successfully when the information they are acquiring is perceived as interesting, useful, and leading to a desired goal.

### **Task-Based Language Teaching**

This approach is based on the use of tasks as the central part unit of planning and instruction in language teaching; language must be meaningful and placed in real communication to promote learning; students learn language by interacting communicatively from the cline-of-difficulty tasks. These principles illustrate that speaking and trying to communicate through the spoken language is the basis for language acquisition. This means that speaking comes from reception and production of whole units of speech which contain lexical items for processing information.

Along this theoretical framework, understanding of L1 and L2 learning process has been explained as well as L1 influence on L2 learning. Researches on the subject have found that L1 and L2 learning processes are alike since learners try to follow the same sequences to internalize the target language. However, the proper acquisition of L2 depends on different variables like learner's cognitive factors, mother tongue, age and affect.

One of the most notorious hypotheses in L2 acquisition is Krashen's theory. It highlights acquisition as an unconscious development and learning as a conscious process due to the fact that it activates monitor, a filter to make utterances. Despite the distinction, both need meaningful input. The hypothesis demonstrates that age is not a variable for acquisition. Moreover, the lexical approach identifies input components, the lexical items, which are of different kinds and are used for conveying different kinds of meaning.

The listing of features about grammar, vocabulary and practice of the most well-known English Language teaching methods and approaches shows that, "there is not certainly use of only one method" in common L2 classes but a blend of methods, in which the teacher is who in the end decides on what methodology is better for the group he teaches (Richards 1988). So, L1 influence is more noticeable if a method comparison is done; as a result of this, small differences in L1 use are seen in all of the methods and approaches, due to they all emphasize in conscious learning, which activates L1 use. However, each method makes at least some progress by activating the learner's cognitive factors, which produce the memorized language, the active responses, and L2 comprehension and understanding.

### **3. METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK**

#### **3.1. Type of Research**

According to Jara, in Mejía (1998), Systematization of experiences is the process of constructive and analytic reflection, on action or partaking experience, through which any relevant fact is described, comprehended, interpreted, and then conceptually categorized. Thus, a consistent knowledge results from this cyclical process, it permits reporting and contrasting the gathered information to the theoretical framework stated. In general, this process contributes to accumulate data, generated from and to the researching practice, to offer future improvements in determined problematic situation by disseminating the insights.

In addition, Verger (1998) states that systematization of experiences is a methodological trend of participatory action research, it belongs to the collective social action research by combining theory and popular teaching practice. Originally, it comes from Latin America but it is quite unknown among social researchers in our context; even though, it has been strategically applied from 1980's to study common teaching in certain environments.

The systematization of experiences is a research for educational, professional, managerial and organizational development. According to Elliot (1991), it is the reflexive process by which educators systematically study their problems in order to guide, correct and evaluate their decisions and actions regarding the improvement of teaching and learning in their individual professional context. Elliot states several characteristics: Primarily, it is focused on helping practitioners evolve with and into researchers. As we know people learn best, and more willingly when they apply what they have learned, when they do it themselves. This research also has a unique social dimension - the research takes place in real-world situations, and aims to solve real problems.

### 3.2 Instruments

Despite the systematization of experiences lists several instruments, such as ethnographic journals, interviews, video-taped recordings and photographs, this proposal basically needs the use of ethnographic journals since the focus of observation is lexicon. Therefore, the personal journal writings were collected in three ethnographic journals (see annexes) by the researchers, immediately after their classes were performed. This collection was taken down by focusing on:

- Which Spanish lexical items are used by the students in EFL class.
- In which moment Spanish lexicon is used by the students.
- What the students' purpose of using Spanish lexicon is.

During the three years, the observations were classified as follows:

- The observations 1 to 4 of adults (see annexes 1 to 4) were done in an Advanced-level group of Praxis Language School in 2004, which developed activities of listening, writing, reading, and speaking.
- The observations 5, 6 and 9 of adults (see annexes 5, 6, and 9) were done in a Beginners-level group of Praxis Language School in 2005, which developed activities of comparing, expressing existences, and using possessive adjectives.
- The observations 7 and 8 of adults (see annexes 7 and 8) were done in an Advanced-level group of Praxis Language School in 2005, which developed activities of using the Present Perfect and the Past Perfect tenses.
- The observation 10 of adults (see annex 10) was done in the test room for Beginners-level students of Praxis Language School in 2005.
- The observations 11 and 12 of adults (see annexes 11 and 12) were done in a Beginners-level group of Colombian Police Officers in their Country Club in 2005 which attended introductory classes of Basic English.
- The observation 13 of adults (see annex 13) was done in the test room for Beginners-level and Advanced-level students of Praxis Language School during two months in 2005.

- The observations 1 and 2 of adolescents (see annexes 14 and 15) were done in 7<sup>th</sup> graders of secondary at Summerhill School in 2005, which attended Social Studies classes.
- The observations 3 to 8 of adolescents (see annexes 16 to 21) were done in 11<sup>th</sup> graders of secondary at Thomas Jefferson School in 2005, which developed speaking, listening, reading and writing activities.
- The observations 1 and 2 of children (see annexes 22 and 23) were done in a pre-school group of Geoffrey Chaucer's School in 2005, which develop activities of vocabulary acquisition.
- The observations 3 to 7 of children (see annexes 24 to 28) were done in first graders of primary school at Melanie Klein School in 2006, which develop activities of vocabulary to increase daily interaction and use of expressions like polite requests in the classroom and school.

### **3.3. Description of Groups Observed**

The data come from classes on a variety of topics taught as part of regular EFL course work. The students are all Spanish native speakers; they are classified into three stages: adults, teenagers, and children.

The observations of the adult students come from two places. In the first one, the majority of learners are university graduates of different professions; there are also undergraduates and employees of diverse jobs. They are all taking a conversational English Learning Program, divided into fifty-five 45-minute classes, at Praxis Language School in Bogotá, for about one to three months, three times a week. In the second place, the learners are Colombian Police Officers, Captains and Lieutenants, who are in their course of rank promotion at Police Officers' Country Club; they are taking a Special English Language (EL) Course, designed by Praxis Language School, in which the basic grammatical structures of English are taught in three 2-hour classes from 8:00 am to 4:00 pm during two Saturdays.

The observations of teenage students take place in two different schools. The first is Thomas Jefferson School, it is a bilingual institution located in the North of Bogotá. Nowadays, it is placed among the first 100 best schools in Colombia (Nivel muy superior) according to the ICFES exam. It develops a revolutionary project based on bilingualism, procedural assessment, course projects, requirements for cycle promotion etc. Students belonging to this institution are around 4, 5, and 6 Colombian Social Statuses and have facilities to be immersed into Anglo-Saxon cultures, to contact bilingual courses or environments, and to develop their English competence in general. These 11<sup>th</sup> grade students, only at school, are exposed to English language for about 26 hours a week, distributed among EFL classes, Math, Social Studies, Science, Arts and Computers. The second is Summerhill School; it is a newly bilingual institution that is starting its bilingual process throughout an intensive English program based on the development of communicative competence. Its students vary between 3 and 5 Colombian Social Statuses; though many of them have an appropriate L2 knowledge, according to the expectations of a bilingual school, many others have very low standards and are not ready to face up such a dense program. This School offers 9 hours a week of English Language classes; also, social studies, math, and computers in English. Given that the program has been applied only for four years, it has many weaknesses to cover due to the partial bilingualism of some of its teachers and the mixture of students with different bilingual levels.

The observations of children students are taken out of two groups: The first is composed of 6 children who are between 4 and 5 years old. They attend 45-minute classes at Geoffrey Chaucer's School from 8:00 to 8:45 am every morning. They are learning English and French simultaneously. They have a high social and economical position. The EL Program they are taking is about EL vocabulary and some short sentences that let children express needs, ideas and make polite requests. They have learned vocabulary related to parts of the body, some space notions as 'up', 'down', 'left' and 'right'. They also recognize geometric shapes; items at school, animals, parts of the house and numbers until 10. The expressions



they already know are: 'may I go to the bathroom, please?' and 'please, tie my shoes'. They are able to answer basic questions like 'what's your name?' and 'what's this?'

The second children group is composed of 27 students who are between 6 and 7 years old. There are 16 boys and 11 girls. They attend 40-minute classes at Melanie Klein School three times a week. They are very respectful and affective students. Most of the time, they have good relationships among themselves. They are spontaneous and are not afraid to speak in front of the group because of their age. The majority of the students has good social and economical position and lives with their complete families. Most of parents are university graduates but few of them speak English. These children come from an EFL course which they received as much vocabulary and commands as possible. They are reaching the process of learning how to read and write in Spanish so they had not had contextualized EL classes before; consequently, this is the first time they have a bilingual teacher.

### **3.4 Description of the groups' EFL Programs**

#### **Adult groups' EFL Program**

The adult groups observed takes classes at Praxis Language School. This institution has a conversational methodology. Its academic plan is divided into two levels: Beginners and Advanced: Beginners has 32 sequential modules and 28 test in 7 textbooks, 6 with exercises to discover the grammar and to practice the structure taught in class, and 1 that contains a 20-question written test per module. The last 4 modules are not tested since they are about a review of most common EL idioms. The modules are explained in classes of 45 minutes each, by going through approximately 15 minutes for the student's understanding (teacher's explanation of the topic), and 30 minutes for the student's practice with the *classwork* ( 40 questions of several situations to activate student's speaking). The

student performance is graded between A to C (A is the highest score) from this questionnaire (see annex No. 32). The tests are usually taken in groups composed of maximum 8 students who can be in different modules; it takes about 45 minutes of oral assessment by teacher's questions that control student's linguistic level of the module he is in. The student's oral performance and written test is graded from 17 to 20 (20 is the highest score). He is allowed to continue with the next module if he passes the test taken.

After passing all the modules and test of Beginners, the student is allowed to continue with Advanced level. It has 22 modules, each divided into 4 parts. Part A is similar to a Beginners class, but is followed with just 1 book that contains several dialogues in each of the 22 modules. Part B is a 45-minute session of listening and speaking: the student listens to a situation on an audio CD three times, and answers 30 questions about it, these ones are in an extra textbook. Part C is about writing: the student has 15 minutes to write a composition of about 70 words about a topic given by the teacher and in accordance with the structure studied in part A; then, he orally presents it in the rest 30 minutes. The last part is the test, this session is similar to a Beginners test except for the variety of students; in this test all of them are in the same module and do not take a written test. Students in parts A, B, and C are assessed from A to C (A is the highest score). Generally, Advanced level is taken in fixed groups of maximum 12 students in fixed 2-period sessions of 90 minutes each, 2 days a week; however, if student's availability demands it, another schedule can be opened. As well these parts are given by only one teacher per group.

In addition to Beginners and Advanced levels, students commonly attend a 90-minute conversation club with a different teacher each. The session is about varied topics, its purpose is to improve student's speaking skill.

## **Teenage Groups' EFL Programs**

The group composed of 11<sup>th</sup> graders at Thomas Jefferson School follows a bilingual program based on students' communicative development. The group attends 7 hours of English a week: 4 hours are destined for the specific subject, 3 for English for specific purposes that, according to students' interest, could be focused on Business, Science, Arts or Math. Besides, they have classes of Computers and Biology in English. The resources this group counts with are *Cambridge first Certificate Star's* student textbook and workbook. They also count with fully audiovisual materials but there is not any English laboratory. The process of evaluation is based on 5 levels of competence, so that every student must go through all of them until they reach at least 3.5 points out of 5.0. The process does not allow any student to reach the next level if the previous one has not been accomplished yet.

The group composed of 7<sup>th</sup> graders at Summerhill School follows a bilingual program based on students' communicative development. The group attends 17 hours of English a week: 9 hours are destined for the specific subject, 4 for Social Studies in English, 2 for Computers, and 2 for Art and Crafts. The English classes are divided into the four basic competences: 2 hours for listening, 2 for reading, 2 for writing, and 3 for speaking. The resources this group counts with are *Express Publishing's* student textbook and workbook, and fully audiovisual materials, but there is not any English laboratory. Summerhill School's evaluation process is based on the 4 basic competences assessment which are put together to obtain only one grade. Students are scored from 1.0 to 5.0; every student must reach at least 3.0 points in order to achieve the goals proposed.

## **Children groups' EFL Programs**

The first children group observed at Geoffrey Chaucer's school attends 45-minute classes from 8:00 to 8:45 am everyday. At this early stage in children's language

learning, the general objective to reach is to acquire Basic English vocabulary related to their daily context, by singing, playing games, taking part in physical activities, having short conversations. These activities are to provide them with opportunities for communicative use of the language and to focus on development of children's skills. The contents designed for this course are composed of eleven main topics: *My school, who am I? Family and house, my city and the country side, animals, likes and dislikes (food), my personal things, Shapes and colors, Numbers (1 – 20), my clothing and action verbs and commands*. These topics are divided into equal numbers of lessons to be studied during the four terms of the school's academic schedule. The most commonly resource for these children's English classes is the 'learning guide', in which they have to follow instructions to do a handwork, such as perforating shapes with the pointer or cutting out pictures to paste them on white papers by placing them in specific positions (up-down). Also, they have a textbook to work on: *Finger Prints level 2. Caroline Linse and Elly Schottman. Macmillan*. The evaluation is seen as a continuous process, presented in a funny, not threatening way. Equally, assessment is based on children's level of effort and enthusiasm. The parameters to take into account are: class exercises, homework, 'learning' guides, handworks, notebook, workbook and some written examinations.

The second children group observed at Melanie Klein School attends 40-minute classes three times a week and two 80-minute classes twice a week. The general objective of this course is to provide students with meaningful vocabulary for them to increase their daily interaction and use of expressions like polite requests in the classroom and school. To achieve this purpose, teachers make available an English environment for children not only in the class moments, but also outside them, giving commands and instructions for extra academic activities. The contents are divided into the three academic terms according to the school schedule. Most of the topics are related to vocabulary and few of them are related to grammar structures: *Family members, School supplies –what's this?, prepositions, likes and dislikes, numbers until 50, action verbs and commands, adjectives, present simple*

*and progressive, What animals can do?, human body parts, days of week, and clothing. Rainbow* is the textbook to work on for this course. The evaluation starts when teacher gives feedback to students and gives children reasons why to feel good in order to encourage positive feelings toward learning. Children should also present some written examinations.

### **3.5 Stages and Procedures**

In accordance with Macintyre (2002) the Systematization of experiences has generally a cycle of six stages. The first is the Problem Identification; it can be an existing, even historical problem, or a newly emerged issue. The stage two is Evaluation; it develops and carries out methods for evaluating the breadth and depth of the problem. The third is Conclusions and Recommendations; they are based on the Evaluation, and provide specific guidance for change and/or continued evaluation. The next one is Application/Practice; it works with the powers that be to take action and to institutionalize the recommendations. Subsequently, the stage five is Reflection on ways in which new practices affect the school community with changes in place. The last stage is Consideration of New Questions; it acknowledges and dialogues about new questions that have emerged from the changes. Have the changes worked? Are there any shortcomings?

The procedure of this monograph goes solely through the first three stages cited by Macintyre due to the general objective of this work is to write a complete report about how the learner's use of Spanish Lexicon in EFL classes influences on foreign language learning.

#### **Stage 1: Problem Identification**

An aspect about Spanish use in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classes emerged since the Faculty of Education of La Salle University confirmed that a problem to research into for the monograph had to be drawn from the pedagogical practice. This happens since it has been seen, in classes at work, that Spanish is

used as an important tool to convey interaction by not only many of the students but also some teachers. By that moment, what to research into about Spanish use in EFL classes was not yet clear. Then, a selection of groups had to be chosen at each of the institutions, where we were working for, to determine which specific situations about the matter were truly present in EFL learning.

In the groups described above several observations were taken down. The groups were not aware of it in any circumstance. One class per week was observed in these groups during two months. The notes about situations when Spanish was used by the students were writing down briefly in the observers' personal ethnographic journals after each class.

In addition, a variety of activities about communication approach were done in these groups. The purpose was to give the students more opportunities to use English as a language for communication. So, every activity had a listening exercise (Fuchs 1995, Ferrer-Hanreddy 1996); a different choice of reading, (Baudoin et al. 1993); lots of opportunities to speak by expressing their opinions or just talking about the topic of the activity; and, fast writing by copying questions, noting down their viewpoints, etc.

Every activity increased the students' motivation to interact with the teacher by using English freely, despite of the fact that topics which deal with unknown English language lexis made them speak less. Therefore, two students' behaviors were noticeable: first, these students often interacted in Spanish while answering exercises and developing class activities by themselves; second, they spoke in English just when the teacher asked them to do so.

The outcome of these activities shows that the use Spanish in class is presented in regards to the students' needs for communication, such as: asking for meanings of words, confirming structures of sentences that are usually made from Spanish grammar rules, confirming teacher's questions, and gaining self confidence when

making statements to express syntactically complex ideas and orders. These needs are in accordance to those different variables that take place in learning a foreign language, such as positive transfer, grammar use, communicative context influence, word choice, modularity, lexicon and phonology.

Thus, it is seen that the students' needs for communication are directly related to the use of Spanish language lexicon in EFL classes, since the students observed use their mother tongue lexical items to associate meanings of target language words, mainly to complete their utterances for an effective communication, then to comprehend teacher's inquiries, or to memorize English Language useful vocabulary.

To sum the problem, Spanish lexicon is frequently used by English language learners to interact with their teacher. For this reason, the EFL learning process might be influenced by the mother tongue; but to what extend the learners' use of Spanish lexicon in EFL class influences on this learning process is the outcome to reach.

## **Stage 2: Evaluation**

The categorization of Spanish lexical items relies on the characteristics given by Lewis (1993) about the Eight Types of Meaning of the Lexical Approach, by Gass (1989) about the Logical Problem Of Foreign Language Learning, and by Littlewood (1998) about Second Language Learning. The categories were selected in accordance with the theoretical framework and by detecting the most constant facts described on the observations. As a result of this, three categories were the most representative: Referential Meaning, Failure and Interference.

The first category consists of the basic meaning of the lexical item, without interpretation or embellishment. The second is about the difficulty of succeeding in L2 learning, since complete success is extremely rare, or perhaps even

nonexistent, this category must be understood from the student's incapacity to communicate ideas, situation that makes him fall back on Spanish to express his utterances or to ask for referential meaning. The last one is the basic problem of foreign language learning arisen primarily out of the special set created by the first language habits. The matrix No. 1 summarizes, in the columns, the most representative samples of each category with their interpretations and definition.

The matrix displays common patterns per each category. For referential meaning (see annex 29), there are two patterns that take place in all of the groups observed: first, the knowledge of the meaning of an EL unknown word is necessary for the student not only to understand any full sentence word by word but also to use it when expressing any idea into a generally short EL sentence. Second, the teacher becomes the main source of meaning of unknown words whether from English to Spanish or vice versa.

There are also more patterns of this category that can be identified in every stage. On one hand, the use of Spanish lexical items in the adult groups is worth to reinforce the use of an EL word in a different co-text. On the other hand, Spanish lexical items become the most important tool for the adolescents to understand English words. In addition, there are two situations in these teenage groups when the use of Spanish lexicon is more frequent: during listening activities and when sophisticated language material is presented.

For children groups, this category shows two extra patterns: when communicating, they do not usually connect previous knowledge of EL words to recently taught EL lexical items. Despite of the fact that students comprehend questions in English, they generally use Spanish lexicon to answer them.

The patterns above show that students make their meaning only as clear as is necessary for effective communication. If it is necessary to distinguish different lexical items into different co-texts, the student will select the word value that allows him to achieve pragmatic purposes (Lewis 1993).



OBSERVATION	INTERPRETATION	CONCEPTUAL CATEGORY	CATEGORY
Annex 29: I was asked about technical vocabulary of the ads we had not contemplated before. Those questions were made part in English, and when they didn't know an English language word, in Spanish, e.g. "What is 'leaflet'?" "¿Cómo digo 'catálogo'?"	Students not only ask about words in their material but also come up with words related to it and useful to express properly. They usually ask for an EL word meaning in English and for an SL word translation in Spanish.	According to Lewis (1993), this category consists of the basic meaning of the lexical item, without interpretation or embellishment.	Referential Meaning
Annex 30: I could notice they weren't able to communicate their feelings in English despite they wanted to; because of they did not know what and how to say in those situations.	Again, the lack of enough lexical items to express ideas causes failure to communicate.	According to Sussan Gass (1989) the difficulty of succeeding in L2 learning, since complete success is extremely rare, or perhaps even nonexistent, this category must be understood from the student's incapacity to communicate ideas, situation that makes him fall back on Spanish to express his utterances or to ask for referential meaning.	Failure
Annex 31: I deduce she usually speaks in English from Mother tongue grammatical structure since she says Spanish-structure-like English sentences like "My mother and your (her) friend were in (at) the supermarket (the day) before yesterday" or "we comes (venimos) to Praxis for (to) study English" or "the people is (are) very nice."	It is noticeable that the student here uses the wrong possessive adjective for "she" by transferring from "su" of Spanish to "your" of English. She also omits "the day" for the time expression "the day before yesterday" because it is said "antes de ayer" in Spanish. Finally, she uses the determined article "the" and matches wrongly "people" with "is" just because it is "la gente es" in Spanish.	According to Littlewood (1998) the basic problem of foreign language learning arisen primarily out of the special set created by the first language habits.	Interference

The most noticeable pattern for the second category, Failure (see annex 30), in both adult groups and teenage groups is the lack of lexical item meanings and uses that causes students refrain from speaking. It happens in four particular situations: when they try to express their own ideas with the knowledge they have, when they attempt to answer a question which contains new vocabulary, when a taught word has not yet been internalized, and when they do not know what part of speech is the lexical item they are using. On the contrary, for children groups, failure is visible when English might turn into an obstacle for student-teacher interaction, because this language is just a subject for them, while Spanish is the language they use to express their ideas and emotions.

The third category, Interference (see annex 31), shows a strategy of transfer in both the adult and teenage groups. It is remarkable in four particular processes: Omission of pronouns, auxiliaries, and lexical items when expressing a sentence on their own; Spanish-like sentence structure or word order when speaking in English; incorrect use of pronouns or lexical items; and internal conceptualization of meanings. In spite of the fact that children groups do not present these processes, the kind of interference they have is phonetic: while they were writing what teacher was saying, most of them do it in the way the word would be written in Spanish; in addition, the children feel the necessity to listen more and speak less.

#### **4. FINAL REPORT**

To find out to what extent the learner's use of Spanish lexicon in English as a Foreign Language classes (EFL) influences on the foreign language learning process, six EFL groups were selected to be observed on students' Spanish lexicon production. The groups came from five different institutions of Bogotá: Geoffrey Chaucer's School and Melanie Klein School for children groups; Summer Hill and Thomas Jefferson for adolescents groups; and Praxis Language School for adults. The observations took three years from 2004 to 2006.

By that moment, three academic works related to the topic had been done at three universities in Bogotá, but neither of them dealt directly to Spanish lexicon influence. Therefore, it was imperative to search for books in concern with L1 influence at the main libraries of the city. The objective of these books was to obtain deep conceptualization about the real role of Spanish lexicon in EFL learning. Thus, the first communicative aspects related to L2 learning process are: the difference between English as a Foreign Language or as a Second Language, mother tongue and Foreign Language plus learning and acquisition. Moreover, characteristics of language production like input, output, context, and lexicon.

Additionally, knowing the L1 and L2 learning process separately helps to understand their similarities that go through stages like the grammatical morphemes, negative and question forming, and knowledge of basic sentence patterns. This differentiation is the starting point to recognize L1 influences on L2 learning process. Eventhough Krashen's theory is the one that better explains the influence, there are subsequently characteristics and factors affecting this development, such as, lack of success, failure, importance of instruction, affective factors, interference, age, and cognitive systems. This background leads to L1 lexicon influence on L2 learning process. Michael Lewis' Lexical Approach considers types of meaning and lexical words as the units that must be considered when influence on L2 communication.

After collecting the theoretical trends, the Systematization of Experiences Research was applied to classify the data gathered from the observations. The most relevant situations of the students' Spanish lexicon use were compared to the theoretical framework; then categorized in three groups which were the most repetitive and coherent with the objectives: Referential Meaning, Failure, and Interference. Afterwards, the three categories and the theoretical framework were triangulated to know what kind of Spanish lexicon is used by the students observed when learning English as a foreign language.

From the analysis of the ethnographic journal descriptions, it is established that the most common lexical items used by them in classes are: words, when the student asks for a single lexical item (e.g. "¿Cómo digo 'con'?" "How do you say 'panfleto'?" "¿Qué es 'kettle'?") (see annex 13); multiword items, that are units composed of several words but recognized as having an independent existence (e.g. "¿Qué es 'bless you'?"); polywords, when the meaning is apparently totally different from the components (e.g. "¿Cómo digo 'de repente'?"); and institutionalized expressions that permit the student to interact in a pragmatic way ("¡the movie is... muy buena, uy sí! Tiene un tema buenísimo") (see annex 13)

The frequency of students' Spanish lexicon use in the EFL classes observed depends on four factors:

- Teacher's methodology. Inasmuch as the teacher pressurizes the students into speaking, they will be aware of the need of using target language for interacting in class; on the contrary, if the usage of L1 is commonly allowed, the students' interest in communicating with L2 will decrease.
- Incomprehensible input. The more sophisticated vocabulary and unknown words are there in class, the more the use of Spanish lexicon by the students. This fact is even more noticeable in listening exercises.

- Ignorance of EL words. At the moment the students are making sentences to express their ideas and do not know the adequate EL word, they ask for it in Spanish.
- Student-student Interaction. They seldom speak in English among them when there is no teacher's monitoring.

Particularly, the students fall back on Spanish in two situations: when they do not recognize a word either written in a text or after being said by the speaker (the teacher or another student), and when they want to express a concept whose English Language (EL) word is still unknown or forgotten. As a result of this, the answer to the original question of this work, *to what extent the learner's use of Spanish lexicon in English as a Foreign Language classes influences on the foreign language learning process*, is responded through the examination of the three categories. Spanish lexicon is needed for Referential Meaning since the ignorance of an EL word makes the student ask for it, commonly by using his mother tongue, either to comprehend or to produce language with a full EL content. Unless this situation is fulfilled, Failure will take place by not permitting the student to speak fluently and successfully. On the contrary, if the situation is satisfied, it seems it makes the student transfer from L1 to L2 by taking the meaning of the L1 word comparable to the one of the L2 word. It means that the student uses Spanish to ask for referential meaning which might generate interference, since the student will treat L2 as L1; as a final point, if the student can not associate his thoughts with L2, because of lack of lexical items, he will fail to produce L2 sentences communicatively.

All these steps described thus far permit accomplishing the objectives initially stated and answering the guiding questions of the monograph. Then, the new insights found from Spanish lexicon influences on L2 learning process are presented in the following conclusions and recommendations.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

1. After analyzing data collected from the described classes, according to both, the theoretical trends and the observations gathered, it is concluded that, in relation to Lewis definition of Referential Meaning (1993), students use L1 as the main tool for understanding L2. Subsequently, Sussan Gass (1989) describes L2 success could be peripheral to the first language acquisition; however, failure in language learning progress only occurs in L2 learning; on the contrary, as the examples of Failure Category show (see annex 30), when learning a second language there are two “grammars” to understand and express meanings. On the face of it, the older the learner the more capacities of generating an infinite number of sentences which can not be expressed in L2 properly, because knowledge and faculties are still absent in the language acquisition device. The examples of Interference (see annex 31) confirm Littlewood’s second language implications (1998), the learner uses what he already knows about language, it means that the process of transfer (interference) is meaningful since the learner does not have to discover from zero language knowledge, because he uses L1 forms to construct L2 ones.
2. The majority of examples of the categories Failure and Interference shows that the students do not yet have real communicative skills when facing situational interactions. This is noticeable when the student can not match the current situation with what he has so far learnt about English in order to make an interactional sentence from his own. This circumstance permits thinking that the students with no situational use of English as a language for interaction are the consequence of grammar-focused teaching or learning, as well as a failure at associating topics of previous classes with the students’ context. As a result of this, students may have a clear idea in mind of what they want to say, but they are unable to picture it with the correct lexicon items when speaking because they have neither enough

stock of vocabulary, nor sufficient word order, nor sentence structures; so that, they commonly say what they can say but not what they want to.

3. The lack of communicative parameters in English leads the student to interact just in classes, usually with only the teacher, by trying to use, the most correctly possible, the grammatical and lexical units learnt as a fact of being able to handle them; so, when the student really has to interact conversationally, he can not simply do it spontaneously because he has used English as a subject for classes but not as a tool for communicating.
4. More frequently than the teacher thinks, the amount of words within sentences he addresses to a beginner, typically after presenting a new topic, makes the learner refrain from speaking in English because of ignorance of lexical items used in the teacher's utterance. This situation consequently makes the student perform in two complementary ways: first, the student starts understanding the teacher's utterance word by word in Spanish by focusing on grammatical and lexical aspects of the sentence. Second, the student starts asking in Spanish about the lexical items meanings, which are sequentially forgotten after the momentary interactions come to an end, or just when starting making his answer. Obviously not every student behaves the same when teacher asks him a question, but there is truly a particular parameter in their language production: they generally answer with short sentences and by using the same words of the question, even though they do not exactly know what the meaning of each word is.
5. It is notorious that the older the learner the higher the presence of interference. According to Krashen (1987), *monitor* participates more steadily in the mental process of language acquisition when the learner is older because he acquires more linguistic capacities with age. On the contrary, children are not yet aware of how L1 structures operate, so they

can acquire L2 ones without evaluating, comparing, and relating them to their mother tongue. Besides, children use Spanish for English comprehension by showing the necessity of translating it into their mother tongue in order to be sure of what they have understood. Therefore, children interact in Spanish with their classmates and teacher during the whole classes.



## **6. RECOMMENDATIONS (Stage 3)**

1. The continuing students' asking of referential meaning should not be seen negatively since the purpose of any language is the communication of meanings, and the distinctions of lexicon items, between languages have purely relational identity (Lewis 1993). This signification and usage may not simply have occasional functions but could increase the students' repertoire by providing optimal conditions for language acquisition. However the distinction of lexicon items does not only deal with its basic meaning because any unit of vocabulary frequently has not only diverse parts of speech, but also various definitions as connotational, pragmatic, contextual, discourse and negotiated.
2. Teachers commonly try to stop students using Spanish in EFL classes because they think it does not enhance L2 learning. However, many researchers in this matter agree that it is senseless to assume that this fact shows failure or sticks L2 learning process. On the contrary, it is a linguistic resource, a product of the process, and a sign of intelligence; therefore, it must not be treated as a student's failure by trying insistently to avoid learners using Spanish when interacting.
3. In order to turn input into intake in EFL classes, it is necessary for the teacher to present the students with meaningful topics to develop either in class or as homework. The most adequate environment, agreeing with Krashen (1987), must contain topics that develop L2 learning (meaningful input) by discovering cohesion and coherence of texts and by permanently holding communicative dynamism. Those topics should allow short direct conversations that permit the student to handle interaction; for instance, how to solve a habitual trouble, a short narration of any student's event, a mild topic to discuss, etc. This approach might not avoid the student to use Spanish lexicon to understand English, but will make him comprehend what

its correct use is: Spanish for understanding not for translating; thus, he will use it less frequently when interacting.

4. When the teacher speaks in English to their students by trying to make his speech comprehensible (using gestures or known vocabulary), they try to speak less in Spanish; however, this is not always the result of lack of interest or comprehending, but the fact they are going through the silent period (Krashen 1987), in which they opt not to speak but to listen in order to acquire more input. This learning stage must be respected by the teacher.
5. As Littlewood (1998) says, methodology may increase L1 usage or not depending on how the teacher utilizes it wisely; because of the learners own utterances are the natural outcome of the system they have been taught, rather than a factor to the process of internalization. So that, inasmuch as English is employed in the EFL classes, students will have the necessity to use it.
6. It is possible to think that children have little initiative to produce output in the foreign language out of the vocabulary they are learning, using it for pointing out or expressing feelings and emotions. However, teachers must realize that English is a life-long skill; so that, before exerting any speaking pressure, a large amount of input must be given.
7. It is strongly recommendable to continue researching on this topic since the insights that have been given, eventhough are relevant, do not yet state definite applicabilities that allow teachers to transform their pedagogical practice. By reason of this, it is necessary to encourage researchers to deepen not only into Spanish lexicon influence but also into the different aspects of L1 influence on L2 learning process dealing with methodology and strategies.

ANNEX No. 1	OBSERVATION No. 1
INSTITUTION: Praxis Language School	DATE: October 1 <sup>st</sup> , 2004
GROUP: Adults, M41B, Listening and comprehension	

OBJECTIVE OBSERVATION	SUBJECTIVE OBSERVATION
<p>The activity is to practise listening and to assess comprehension with questions about the lecture. The reading activity is to associate sounds with words.</p> <p>The listening activity was taken with attention since the students tried to get the ideas expressed on the tape. However, no all the main ideas were gotten. <b>For two students, a man and a woman, this situation let them down a bit because they hoped to understand more.</b> Reading as listening was easy since they had the transcript. They could understand more about the lecture from this and their performance at speaking improved a lot. <b>Vocabulary was not really a trouble since they had dictionaries and they could look unknown words up.</b> Apart from this, I helped them comprehend their meanings. Only three of them spoke well and frequently about the topic. The problems I detected were about verb form and sentence structure.</p> <p>Their behaviour was attentive. <b>They helped each other when they did not understand something. Also, they asked me more about the differences among vocabulary worked.</b></p> <p>The activity was a lot useful since they caught much vocabulary they did not know or had seen before. I think I helped them get vocabulary they would be able to use frequently.</p> <p><b>Most of the questions they asked me were to know the meaning of unknown words, for instance, "What's pamphlet?"</b> Something good is that they at least asked me in English. Therefore my meaning was as possible given in English by using descriptions of the object or word asked. In this session I could not get some other kind of questions different from those described above.</p>	<p><b>FAILURE</b></p> <p><b>REFERENTIAL MEANING (WORDS)</b></p> <p><b>DIFFERENTIAL MEANING (WORDS)</b></p> <p><b>REFERENTIAL MEANING (WORDS), NEGOTIATED MEANING (WORDS, INSTITUTIONALIZED EXPRESSIONS)</b></p>

ANNEX No. 2	OBSERVATION No. 2
INSTITUTION: Praxis Language School	DATE: October 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 2004
GROUP: Adults, M43B, Listening and Comprehension	

OBJECTIVE OBSERVATION	SUBJECTIVE OBSERVATION
<p>The purpose of the activity is to train them to listen without reading the transcript. The exercise was a bit more demanding for them due to they had to comprehend and talked about the ideas in the reading. They also had to listen to some questions on the tape about the reading and answering them. This activity was to emphasize more on listening from specific information as it promoted discussion about the topic.</p> <p>At the beginning of the session, the students' performance showed the listening was a bit difficult but as the activity went on and some ideas were explained, it became easier. When I spoke about my comprehension ideas, some students neither accept nor contradict them and just let the others participate -those ones who usually speak in class. I'm sure they didn't do that because they didn't understand much of the reading but just because they didn't know how to express their own ideas; when they tried to say something about the topic they just gave up speaking by commonly saying "No, teacher, nothing."</p> <p>Despite nobody spoke too much, the discipline was always good and they listened attentively to each other.</p> <p>The activity is in itself very good for high-intermediate levels or advanced ones since the excerpt has much vocabulary that can be learnt only from a long way of English studying. However, after explaining various meanings to them, they started understanding more and more.</p> <p>Questions they asked me were about meaning of unknown words; in addition, they asked me for how to say particular words in English, for instance, "¿Cómo digo los pamphlets que llegan a la casa?" This very same question was asked in Spanish but I realized it later. I deduce she usually speaks in English from Mother tongue grammatical structure since she says Spanish-structure-like English sentences like "My mother and your (her) friend were in (at) the supermarket (the day) before yesterday" or "we comes (venimos) to Praxis for (to) study English" or "the people is (are) very nice."</p>	

ANNEX No. 3	OBSERVATION No. 3
INSTITUTION: Praxis Language School	DATE: October 9 <sup>th</sup> , 2004
GROUP: Adults, M43C, Reading and Writing	

OBJECTIVE OBSERVATION	SUBJECTIVE OBSERVATION
<p>The activity is to practise reading and understanding with short stories and questions to get a general idea of imaginary situations. The speaking about the story is to assess students' comprehension and to give them the opportunity to speak about imaginary situations by using if/would sentences. Also, a writing activity to practise sentence structure of conditionals and narrative skills. The listening is to get specific information about a TV programme announcement by 4 questions that are also recorded.</p> <p>The first two activities were performed in short time, the students paid great attention and interest in the topic. When they spoke about the topic in groups, I noticed they pushed themselves to do it in English, even when I pretended not to be paying attention to what they were doing.</p> <p>I think writing was successful since the topics of the imaginary situations were designed by taking into account their context (all of them have a professional degree). On the contrary, listening was frustrating the first time played since only 2 students got some of the information required, but the next times were easier and the questions were answered orally without great difficulty of comprehension.</p> <p>Students motivation was OK because they all worked on the exercises and spoke freely giving even wrong answers, I mean, answers that didn't correspond to the answers made. Teacher's participation was just for guidance rather than grammar correction of students' utterances.</p> <p>When activities push them to think about possible circumstances which involve their closest context, they try to perform more than when the circumstances are away from.</p> <p>Listening is a matter of guiding them through the key words to enhance them to feel they are able to comprehend and get more information.</p> <p>No questions gotten about vocabulary doubts.</p>	

ANNEX No. 4	OBSERVATION No. 4
INSTITUTION: Praxis Language School	DATE: October 14 <sup>th</sup> , 2004
GROUP: Adults, M43A, Speaking	

OBJECTIVE OBSERVATION	SUBJECTIVE OBSERVATION
<p>The students were given 3 different kinds of pictures about advertisements. First they talked about how they understood the pictures. I assessed them from that non-prose interpretation. They had the opportunity to watch the 3 pictures; then they could support their ideas from the others since we three had the same pictures. They talked about advantages and disadvantages not only of the ads but also about advertising. Listening to teacher's directions and ideas was easy since they had already worked on the topic and vocabulary.</p> <p>They were a bit surprised at the beginning of the session and expectant for the rest of their classmates who never showed up –this group is composed of 7 students. But as soon as the activity started, their attention got down on the topic. On the contrary, I didn't expect their concentration on the topic would be that high and their performance superior that before (previous sessions). I guess the fewer the students, the more participation they have.</p> <p>I was asked about technical vocabulary of the ads we had not contemplated before. Those questions were made part in English, and when they didn't know an English language word, in Spanish, e.g. "What is "leaflet"?" "¿Cómo digo "catálogo"?"</p>	

ANNEX No. 5	OBSERVATION No. 5
INSTITUTION: Praxis Language School	DATE: February 18 <sup>th</sup> , 2005
GROUP: Adults, M16, Existences	

OBJECTIVE OBSERVATION	SUBJECTIVE OBSERVATION
<p>The activities include presentation of the topic, watching a video about the topic, answering questions from the student books, and questions from teacher classwork book in an oral way.</p> <p>At the beginning of the class, I could realize they had already answered the questions of their books. It made the class a lot easier and nicer to practise with the classwork, a bit more, orally in the topic. However, <i>two girls had problems with sentence structure, they confused the location of adverbials for place with adverbials for time, e.g. "there were in my kitchen 2 apples yesterday" or "In my house there are two bathrooms."</i> I tried to let them notice this problem by organizing myself their answers and had them repeat them as well ("there were 2 apples in my kitchen yesterday.") Then, I asked them similar questions to test if they had understood and, by the same way, to test if they would be able to organize the sentences properly. At the beginning it was not easy, but little by little, by listening to the rest of the classmates and me, they improved. About the exercises of the book, as they were already done, I decided on having the students close their books and asking them about the questions to train their comprehension and speaking skills. The video has no subtitles and is also uncaptioned, so students have to comprehend what on the video is said by listening to it carefully. Most of the way I had to replay it twice or more (but not more than 3 times) to permit them to comprehend it. When I saw they would not be able to get what on the video was said, I asked them those questions informally. But this video, specifically, was no difficult, so they comprehended it at ease.</p> <p><i>The amount of Spanish used is levelled at 20% since the questions they used Spanish in were about vocabulary, for instance, "Teacher, what is <i>town</i>? What is <i>jungle</i>? Qué es <i>bush</i>?) Curiously they asked in English but waiting for an answer in Spanish. I tried to explain the unknown word in English (to practise also my semantic skills) but when one of them understood just said the word in Spanish ("ah! <i>pueblo</i>), queerly waiting for my confirmation.</i></p>	<p>Experience has taught me repetition is a lot better than grammatical explanations.</p> <p>it is a good technique to let them mechanize English way of speaking. It served as a majestic tool to remember useful vocabulary from the book and also to mechanize the sentence structure. I did this not to let them get frustrated in their listening skills. It was a bit difficult to them.</p> <p>Perhaps with my confirmation I myself am allowing Spanish in class.</p>

ANNEX No. 6	OBSERVATION No. 6
INSTITUTION: Praxis Language School	DATE: February 26 <sup>th</sup> , 2005
GROUP: Adults, M19, Comparatives	

OBJECTIVE OBSERVATION	SUBJECTIVE OBSERVATION
<p>The presentation of the topic is done by using the board. There is also a video and a questionnaire to practise the structure orally.</p> <p>All of them had already had classes with me. 4 of them had been in my class of Module 16 about uses of <i>there are</i> and <i>there is</i> for countable nouns. One of them, a woman, was repeating the module because she had had problems at distinguishing uses of <i>there is</i> for countable nouns and then for uncountable nouns. Either way I just followed the class as if it were the first class for everybody. Despite of this, she didn't say a word that showed she just knew the topic or the answer of any of my questions. Of course I had to correct some mistakes of pronunciation, above all about /ðer ar/ what was said like /ðei ar/ and vice versa. I also could notice some doubts about <i>little</i>, <i>a bit of</i>, and <i>a lot of</i>. Despite of these phrases were not part of the class, I explained them to clarify and perhaps to increase their stock of vocabulary. I could sometimes see they used <i>there are</i> when they imagined large quantities of uncountable nouns ("there are much sugar") or when they did not know that that noun was uncountable in English ("two pizzas"), but after a gesture from me they realized something was wrong and then corrected the sentence at once.</p> <p>It is an integrated group that always helps one to another.</p> <p>Questions in Spanish were made to verify the lexicon items in English, for example, "<i>more than</i>" es "<i>más que</i>", cierto?" As seen the question was made in Spanish, they however needed confirmation in their mother tongue to comprehend and understand English a lot better.</p> <p>On the other hand, they could not express many ideas due to lack of useful vocabulary. At these moments I decided to paraphrase the original question for another easier to comprehend. I sensed they felt a lot disappointed at not being able to answer the original question. However they didn't ask for any translation of the words they could not get.</p>	<p>All of them performed well.</p> <p>Take opportunities to let them use vocabulary they are more familiar with.</p> <p>It is a common mistake.</p> <p>Gestures are less cruel than oral interruptions. It denotes they already have an English way of acquisition and it is also working perfectly in their brains. It is, to me, good for their acquisition matters. They also help each other acquire structuralization.</p> <p>Does it cause frustration?</p>



ANNEX No. 7	OBSERVATION No. 7
INSTITUTION: Praxis Language School	DATE: February 26 <sup>th</sup> , 2005
GROUP: Adults, M39A, Past Simple and Past Progressive	

OBJECTIVE OBSERVATION	SUBJECTIVE OBSERVATION
<p>For the activities there is also a brief introduction of the topic, it is written on the board. Students will read randomly some dialogues from their textbooks. Teacher corrects pronunciation, intonation, reading and understanding. After each dialogue there are some questions about the topic to practise speaking and comprehension skills.</p> <p>I started the class with just three students, the adolescent, a woman and a man. After 10 minutes 2 women arrived. Neither of them two had had class with me before. So I just explained briefly what I had just explained to the first students I had been with since the beginning. Fortunately, the two women who had arrived late understood my short explanation since they answered some of my testing questions clearly. <i>When I had them read the dialogue and answer my questions for understanding, I started realizing the young woman had problems with vocabulary since she asked me "what is this?" or "Esto es pueblo?" to make an answer. I pushed her to use English at least to make me the questions but she just said she couldn't do it because she did not know how to.</i> At those moments I looked towards my students who I knew could give a proper answer to the adolescent's doubts. I also pushed them to use English, <i>but in the end they gave up as well and used Spanish to give the meaning of a sentence or word.</i> I also tried to question that girl less, just to give her opportunities to assimilate the structure before being asked again. I worked well, after 3 or 4 similar questions; she could manage to answer, lazily, but correctly.</p> <p>There was a moment when I had to go to the board to explain the mixture of the two tenses. At that instant, <i>they cleared each other their own doubts in Spanish.</i> I had to write just one example on the board. As soon as I finished doing this, I started explaining the mixture by making my students be quiet and attentive to my words. They got it at once, but when I had to give them cue words to create their own situations they got lost. After, they were really good at making their situations. Three of them tried to participate more than the two women who had arrived late.</p> <p>I also noticed that at this level of advance students use English to try to communicate their ideas among each one. But it's done just when the teacher is present. In the corridors they use Spanish.</p>	<p>I think restarting a class by explaining the topic again when some students have arrived late bores those who arrived on time.</p> <p>I am sure she asked me in Spanish because teachers had allowed her to do it before.</p> <p>It shows they still have no domain in L2.</p> <p>This is a good technique I have learnt throughout my experience in teaching: let students hear the others to motivate themselves to speak. Have students get knowledge by their peers, not only by the teacher. I let them do this. I thought it would work as a tool to save explanations that would waste the class time. Teacher's previous interaction gives students self confidence to participate more in class. I think they didn't understand my directions for this exercise; so, I gave them more than 3 examples (in English) to make myself understood. I guess it was due to those two women had never seen me or taken class with me before.</p>

ANNEX No. 8	OBSERVATION No. 8
INSTITUTION: Praxis Language School	DATE: February 28 <sup>th</sup> , 2005
GROUP: Adults, M42A, Past Perfect	

OBJECTIVE OBSERVATION	SUBJECTIVE OBSERVATION
<p>There is a listening exercise for general understanding. Also an explanation to activate uses of <i>had + Past Participle</i>. Developing of skits to practise composition.</p> <p>I had explained <i>had + Past Participle</i> by using an example previously written on the board and by drawing it in a time line. Now I can notice that during my brief explanation the 3 teenagers (all of them women) were speaking about their yesterday's activities in Spanish. Then I realized that they had been friends for about 2 months. To explain this topic I used first <i>have + Past Participle</i> and then <i>had + Past Participle</i> with so many examples (5 or 6) that, in the time line, all the activities referring to the past perfect tense were clear for everybody, except for teenagers. They couldn't understand so well my examples until I used Spanish as an understanding tool ("Yo había ido"). After that they finally understood and could quite give me some examples, but they were missing of vocabulary, verbs in the past and past participle express properly. It was when I saw they took out a list of verbs to understand and communicate themselves properly. After this, I mistook a sentence on purpose; they all got it, the adults first.</p> <p>This caused everyday situations (situational language) they manage in English (teenagers only laughed). I could notice they weren't able to communicate their feelings in English despite they wanted to; because of they did not know what and how to say in those situations.</p>	<p>I could notice the adults could understand the topic easily but the teenagers couldn't. I wondered why.</p> <p>Perhaps when they have acquainted, English communication is broken because Spanish rules their communication on.</p> <p>I think this exercise is great for listening, for trying to comprehend. It was the only sentence in Spanish I thought I used.</p> <p>It was funny to create a laughing situation. As well, it confirms what is written above: they use too much Spanish while English is absolutely broken.</p>

ANNEX No. 9	OBSERVATION No. 9
INSTITUTION: Praxis Language School	DATE: March 11 <sup>th</sup> , 2005
GROUP: Adults, M5, Possessive Adjectives	

OBJECTIVE OBSERVATION	SUBJECTIVE OBSERVATION
<p>The topic is introduced by presenting a family and its integrants. From this, the uses of verb <i>to be</i> are introduced. Then there are some questions in affirmative and negative using all the pronouns. The last activities are about professions and occupations. There is also the presentation of possessive adjective pronouns.</p> <p>The seven students arrived 7 minutes late. Three of them met each other 2 classes before, and have become good friends. I started the class normally. But in this one, I had a difficulty, I had no video. In the beginning I thought it would be no important and necessary but by going through the class, I realized it was too important. So I took advantage of the board but only to write on the necessary words (subject pronouns and, in front of each one, its respective possessive adjective pronoun). I usually use Spanish in this stage when slow students after having written on the board every pronoun (first <i>his, her</i>). But my use of Spanish is just to say “El <i>su</i> de <i>él</i>” or “el <i>su</i> de <i>ella</i>.” More than this, I do not use Spanish for anything else. While they were reading I was repeating the meaning of every pronoun but this time in English. There were no comments about this from the students. After the reading I asked them if there were any questions. No. So I started asking them the questions from their books (I took only one book as a reference and I covered the questions with a sheet of paper letting only visible the pictures.) Every question I asked was described with my index finger on its respective picture. In this exercise I had no troubles of understanding with two students (Hugo and Gladys); however, with Lisaminel and Alejandro, I had to repeat slowly and emphasizing on the structure –order- of the sentences since in their answers they mistook frequently by using Spanish-like order (e.g. “the book is of he” or “is of she”. In the affirmative answers came out a problem I had not realized clearly before: they confused <i>his</i> with <i>he’s</i>, and because of this, their answers were wrong and incomprehensible. And not only this, <i>her</i>, with <i>she</i>, <i>hers</i>. They thought they both were the same and their answers were like “his (he’s) brother of she (hers)”, “her (she) is his brother.” I didn’t write anything of this on the board but just repeated their answers correctly to let them repeat them accurately. Another problem was the</p>	<p>I think the woman and the man (Hugo) like each other. I say this due to the way they treat one to another.</p> <p>When you have some facilities, you get used to using them. You depend on them.</p> <p>I have seen that by using no Spanish for this topic to explain possessive adjective pronouns to slow students, the assimilation of them is too difficult and delay the class as well as allows the students use more Spanish when they ask about the meaning of every possessive adjective pronoun and when they are used.</p> <p>However, am I promoting the use of Spanish in class?</p> <p>We create a message with a combination of vocabulary plus extralinguistic information.</p> <p>This allows students focus more on the message rather than on form.</p>

<p>confusion between <i>his/her</i> and <i>your</i>, “this is your (her) pencil” or “your (his) name is Luke”. With a gesture of “possession” the mistake was noticed at once and corrected at the moment. When I saw there were just 7 minutes left to be over I comprehended I could not be able to finish the full activities planned; besides, by seeing the problems had in class, I chose to practise more by using some of the students’ belongings. I had them repeat the module to complete the class in another session. Luckily I did not notice the two smart students got desperate by the two slow students’ troubles.</p>	<p>Teachers should focus on encouraging acquisition, on providing input that stimulates the subconscious language acquisition potential.</p>
--	--

ANNEX No. 10	OBSERVATION No. 10
INSTITUTION: Praxis Language School	DATE: March 18 <sup>th</sup> , 2005
GROUP: TEST ROOM	

OBJECTIVE OBSERVATION	SUBJECTIVE OBSERVATION
<p>After every class the student has to take a test in its oral and written part. The written part is in the student's book and it is about 20 yes/no questions about the topic of the module. The oral part consists of general questions about the topic of the module but from a life-like situation. In this part, the teacher can ask about previous modules only if the question can be attached to the topic that is taken by the student.</p> <p>Finding out how often students use Spanish in test has been a mystery I have always had. It is because the test room is the place where they are less able to use Spanish. There, the students know they have to show how much they are able to communicate in English. If they can do so, they feel they are going well in their process. I started making a list of every situation when Spanish was used by the students. If one of them was repeated, for its closely similarities to another one, I just marked another point to the score of the category. If it was a new situation, I just added it to the list. Now I am going to write the list in order of score, since the situation that got the highest store to the one that got the lowest score:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The teacher explains complex and abstract terms (score 9). "<i>will</i> es lo más probable y <i>going to</i> para los planes, algo seguro."</li> <li>2. Students for vocabulary (score 9). "Teacher qué es <i>layover</i>?" "No entendí que era <i>owner</i>?"</li> <li>3. Students to explain what was done in the homework (score 7). "Bueno, yo quise decir que ellos no eran sus dueños."</li> <li>4. Students to confirm questions made by the teacher (score 7). "¿Que si yo he viajado fuera del país?"</li> <li>5. Among students to clarify teacher's questions (score 5). "Que a qué hora te despiertas."</li> <li>6. Students to clarify uses and concepts of English (score 5). "O sea que sólo uso <i>there will be</i> para futuro en singular y plural."</li> <li>7. Students to explain previous activities (score 4). "Es que yo no vine ayer al test, solo a la clase."</li> </ol>	<p>it is a room with a round table in the center, 6 chairs for the students around it and 4 chairs more by the walls.</p> <p>So, to me, this room will show me in what circumstances (obligatory ones) students are needed to take advantage of their mother tongue to express what they need to. These are variables affecting the choice of language: to whom L1 is speaking, where and when L1 is speaking, why !! is speaking, what L1 is speaking about.</p> <p>Variability: the learner performs differently on different occasions. The influence upon the students in a language event systematically determines the form, the appropriacy and the meaning of utterances.</p>

8. Students to ask for repetition (score 4). "¿Me repites por favor?"
9. Students to express common expressions (score 4). "¡Uch, qué boba!" "¡O sea, grave!"
10. Students to confirm questions made by another person different from the teacher (score 1). "¿Qué dijo, qué si era enfermera?"
11. Students to give commands (score 1). "¿Me pasas una hojita por fa'?"
12. Students to ask how another person is that day (score 1). "Hola ¿Cómo te va?"

During that week, I was the test teacher. I tried to fill the entire list in the most honest way. I think I did not let any item get away since I was up to assess students. I also wrote some other comments about Spanish-English use and the students' reaction:

1. When the teacher only uses English for communication, students feel lack of confidence; they get nervous and can't interact.
2. The students' lack of vocabulary cuts off their communication.
3. English is not well used for casual communication. It is seen just as a language for classes, or simply used at the academy for exclusively talking to the teachers. (Failure, because it is not seen as a new means for communicating everywhere)
4. The last item occurs probably either because of English for classes presents no alternatives (repetition of the same structures); or due to English for communication presents no alternatives from neither the teacher, nor the book, nor the class; the student then must create the message.
5. How to know you are thinking in English: if you are speaking in English and your mind remains quite blank at the moment of looking for the fit word to complete your idea, you have to recur to a strategy of conveying meaning. If not, you just express the concept in Spanish.
6. When teacher cuts off students' speaking, it creates gaps into which teacher's comments are not clearly understood by them leading the students fail when trying to resume their speaking.

When there are too many students in test, my objectivity fails. I mean, I just assess their performance by taking into account the time and the few answers they give. Obviously if I had fewer students or more time, I would correct them more accurately. But another aspect that interferes in this process is the amount of teachers the teacher must assess per shift. At the end of it, after approximately 38 students

Students sometimes prefer just few questions for oral tests.

assessed, the teacher's brain is so tired out that he does not want to correct any student more.	
--	--

ANNEX No. 11	OBSERVATION No. 11
INSTITUTION: Police Officers' Country Club	DATE: April 2 <sup>nd</sup> , 2005
GROUP: Adults, M1, Basic Concepts	

OBJECTIVE OBSERVATION	SUBJECTIVE OBSERVATION
<p>The class took place at the Police Officer's country club in La Colina neighborhood. This place has 15 classrooms with about 30 chairs each one, an ample board, a desk and a chair for the teacher, 3 large windows on the right. The class was composed of 15 police officers: 7 captains, 4 lieutenants, and 4 second lieutenants. There was only one woman (a lieutenant). It was also divided into 3 sessions a day: two of 2 periods, and the other of 1 hour and a half. All the officers of the class were in the beginning English linguistic level of proficiency. So, the topics started since the most basic vocabulary until the uses of pronouns. For Praxis' modules, from module 1 to module 6.</p> <p>I want to talk about 4 items I think are the most important for that Saturday. The items include the teacher's reactions, the class procedure and the officers' workout.</p> <p>How did I feel? I do confess I was anxious to start living this new experience since I had never lived one like this before. In the morning, at about 7:30, I could see the officers' looks be addressed to us. When finally the material for the class was given out, and the instructions and the introduction of the major were said, I first explained to them, in Spanish, how I was going to step the class by highlighting that they were in module 1. I also explained the material and the way we were going to work with it. After, I gave it out by rows as I was asking them what kind of expectations they had for this short course. The first thing I did for the class was to give them useful vocabulary about places of the city, parts of the body, clothing (about military uniforms and casual clothes), accessories of wearing, and the classroom. I was writing the words on the board as I pronounced them. After I had them repeat them one by one after me. Later I explained when to use <i>a/an/the/some</i>, and had the officers one by one randomly use them according to the words I was pointing out on the board. The next topic was regular and irregular plurals. I clean the board up and wrote the rules for plurals. I also wrote in blue the irregular plurals. Then I did a 5-minute oral activity about plurals and articles. There were no many mistakes to correct. Then I cleaned the board again and I told them that while I was writing some</p>	<p>They just have a poor idea about English language.</p> <p>I am sure they were anxious too.</p> <p>I felt nervous but eager to start the class and see how I was going to perform it. I started since the beginning my classes in Spanish because I knew they would not be able to understand me if I had spoken only in English.</p> <p>They did not talk much but I realized they wanted to learn, at least, basic matters of English.</p>



<p>words on the board for the next topic, they had to read their notes about the topics we had just learnt. This topic was demonstratives. They got it at once even by using the word order adjective-noun. Then I saw they were all concentrated on the class. After the first break I started the class by using the chart I had on the board and <i>is/are</i> sentences. It was easy for them as well. Then we started using the material for written exercises. While they were answering them I realized, by the questions they made me when they called for my help, that they had had and discovered many doubts that they did not ask for during the explanation and oral practice. I resolved all of them, I think, and then we together corrected the exercises orally. Later I explained the topic that caused a lot of difficulties to them: <i>neither/both</i> uses. We spent about 1 hour going from the explanation to the exercises. After lunch, we spent 20 minutes more. The last topic was pronouns and verb <i>to be</i>. It was easily understood; however, the possessive pronouns were a bit difficult, and for the written exercises the previous situation of doubts happened again. We did not do any oral practice for this topic.</p> <p>Spanish I used: I used about 80% of Spanish in the sessions simply because the atmosphere demanded it. I realized it since the first 10 minutes of the sessions they were not well motivated for the class. They had it under the perspective of a no-too-much important subject. They also do not need English for their profession. They had to carry out these sessions by an order of their major (Colombian Defense Minister). I used Spanish for all the explanations. When I tried to explain demonstratives in English, they started frowning and did not understand them.</p> <p>English I used: it was for pronunciation, repetition, and oral exercises, when they also read both the questions and answers. They kept a non-gesture expression when I used English. I always accompanied my speech in English with manners and gestures, so they could understand what I was asking about or for. I had them repeat the sentence when they mispronounced a word within it.</p> <p>They learned. The written exercises showed it was so. They were almost all correct. The amount of students in class did not allow too much person-to-person interaction. At the end of the day, I did not do any complex exercises just because we were finishing the journey and I know concentration fall at these moments. All of them shook my hand congratulating me for the job done. The lieutenants got better grades than the captains.</p>	<p>Actually I explained it with the terms “characteristic + object.” It is better to use familiar words than grammatical terms for these kinds of topics.</p> <p>It is also quite difficult to expect good answers when they are just collecting information without any practice or interaction.</p> <p>I think it happened because the sentences they had to make were quite long and demanded more concentration and logic.</p> <p>I could also see that by using Spanish I got closer to them and created an atmosphere of confidence by not making them feel bad and coarse to speak and ask for clarifications.</p> <p>Their understanding showed they had learnt because when I corrected the exercises orally, they said not only one possible answer but two, even three. I am sure they learned about English structures (the topics seen) but to say there is a pattern of production of language after the session is difficult just because there was not enough time for oral practice. Now I understand that English is acquired when you dare speak in it.</p> <p>And to me, it turns out to be difficult to affirm they can handle a basic communication in English with the topics seen. However, I did create motivation in them to know more about English and to be conscious it can be relevant for their careers.</p>
--	--

ANNEX No. 12	OBSERVATION No. 12
INSTITUTION: Police Officers' Country Club	DATE: April 9 <sup>th</sup> , 2006
GROUP: Adults, M2, Basic Concepts	

OBJECTIVE OBSERVATION	SUBJECTIVE OBSERVATION
<p>Particularly, this class is exactly as the previous description. The only difference is that the officers were not sitting in rows but in a semi-horse arrangement.</p> <p>Officers did not arrive exactly on time. They were complete at 8:10 am. Some of them (more the lieutenants and second lieutenants) were sleepy. They looked stayed-up. Some captains told me they had been studying and handing in reports because of they had not had classes in Ester and professors were trying to update the seminars to carry out the schedule and topics planned. They also told me that the next Tuesday they would have to attend classes until 8:00 pm. At that moment I asked them for their seminar schedule. They answered it was from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm. In spite of this situation, they kept studying. Another aspect I want to highlight here is that they after a week had understood English better. I noticed this since we started reviewing the topics seen last Saturday; they answered my questions quicker and with fewer mistakes.</p> <p>Due to I had seen and heard their lazy attitude, I decided to perform my class slowly and non-stressfully but dynamically. After the reviewing I explained a bit more the uses of the Saxon possessive. I did it just as an introduction for the next topic, the family. I tried to perform this topic by using only English but their faces showed me they did not understand me that much. <b>So I asked for translation of vocabulary of the family</b>, then I gave them some directions to draw their own family on a piece of paper. I did it in English but when I went round them, just half of them had made it following quite correctly my directions. I gave the directions in Spanish so. Afterwards I went round them again and took some notebooks asking the owners about their family tree. When I asked one of them, the others helped him. Then we worked with the sample family tree of the book. There were one captain and one lieutenant that always answered quicker than the others. I took advantage of this situation to fasten the class so I could finish the topic before the fist block was over. In the second block I explained prepositions. At the beginning I thought about writing the prepositions on the board but I drew the concepts instead. They got them easily. First I asked them to</p>	<p>Of course with that tough schedule, by Saturday they were tired out of studying. When a teacher is very concerned about students, it can make him/her change the way his/her class is performed.</p> <p>It showed me they were at least motivated and interested in keeping learning things about English.</p> <p>It could have been so because of I talked to them in Spanish since the beginning. It also helped me control the class.</p> <p>Sometimes when you hear peers answering correctly what you are learning you dare speak more, too.</p> <p>It is better to work with concepts, that push understanding, rather than with translation,</p>

<p>answer in English according to my place in the classroom, later to references (the board, the table, the windows, etc.) they did it well by answering in unison. Then I had a captain (the one that seemed to know more) and the woman lieutenant stand up and stay in front of the class to practice object pronouns alternating their places. In this exercise they had a lot of mistakes of sentence structure, it was Spanish-like, e.g. “is in the table” when the correct answer was “it is on the table.” Or “in front of the board is the teacher.” So I wrote on the board the order of the answer sentence (they had to say “___ is/are <u>preposition</u> ___”), after this their answers were all correct. The last activity for this topic was by taking into account the objects of the classroom. It was easy as well. After lunch, at 1:30 pm. I had planned to teach those uses of, at least, the present progressive tense, but one captain told me if he was allowed to perform a game. I accepted. He did an observation exercise: a description of a thief who a captain had to catch. It relaxed the group that way they asked for another game. The same captain so nicely offered himself to perform it. It was about their context, one calling another one according to their ranks by showing the own respect; the officer who loses had to go to the tail of the row. I participated in the two games. Then I tried to start the topic I had planned but they told me they actually did not want to attend the class more since they were tired out. I was concerned about how they were feeling. There were some puzzles and guesses. The last one was one neither of us could resolve. At the end, when the time was over, we had definitely done no class at all. There was a common agreement not to do it and all of us ended up happy with all the activities we had done the last two Saturdays. I gave them all 4.8 for grade, agreement as well.</p>	<p>that increases the use of Spanish in the student’s mind.</p> <p>It is writing grammar and structures but in a hidden way.</p> <p>Are feelings involved in classes?</p>
--	---

## ANNEX 13

INSTITUTION: Praxis Language School – Test Room

El salón de test es el punto principal donde se puede observar el proceso del aprendizaje y adquisición del inglés con el método Mr. Frank. Allí se encuentran las dos variables más importantes que se toman en cuenta para el desarrollo de cualquier observación relacionada con los idiomas, los estudiantes y el lenguaje que se produce. Para identificarlas y mirar cómo toman parte activa en un test, tomé una referencia de tiempo desde mayo 16 hasta junio 17, con un promedio de 27 alumnos por día. La primera semana la dediqué a mirar la comprensión de las preguntas que yo les hacía a los estudiantes junto con la manera que me interrogaban por aclaraciones o confirmación para responder correctamente; desde la segunda semana, y como consecuencia de los apuntes generados en la semana anterior, indagué por la calidad y cantidad de input y output que se generaba en test, tanto del profesor como del alumno; la tercera y cuarta semana tuvo que ver con el cómo preguntar y el qué preguntar para lograr comunicación. La última semana sirvió para concatenar ciertas técnicas que ayudaron no sólo a comparar la calidad de lenguaje sino la cantidad del mismo. Obviamente no todos los estudiantes se comportaron igual pero sí se producía un parámetro particular que los homogeniza en su producción de lenguaje: frases cortas y conectadas a la casi totalidad de la pregunta. Para tal efecto, tomé como mayor referencia aquellos estudiantes (33 en total) que asistieron continuamente (por lo menos de 2 a 3 veces por semana) y que avanzaron en el período de tiempo referido 16 módulos en Beginners, 12 desde Beginners a Advanced, y 14 en sólo advanced (de esos 33 alumnos, 13 se encuentran en Beginners, 11 pasaron de Beginners a Advanced, y 9 ya estaban en Advanced, la mayoría en la parte A, 4 en la B, ninguno en C). Cabe anotar que ninguno de los estudiantes sabía sobre mi observación y por lo tanto su comportamiento se puede calificar de real en el normal desempeño en un test.

Hay cuatro aspectos principales que justifican el por qué el lenguaje que se produce es una variable del test y se debe observar para tener una idea de cómo el alumno aprende con las preguntas que se hacen para evaluar su rendimiento: ¿Deben ser estas preguntas las del classwork? ¿Deben partir estas del classwork o deben estar fuera de este pero unidas al tema del modulo? Cada una de estas alternativas las tomé en cuenta pero luego hablaré de sus pro y contra. El segundo aspecto son las mismas variables del lenguaje inglés: ¿dónde?, ¿cómo?, y ¿para qué se produce? De

## OBSERVATION #13

May 16<sup>th</sup> to June 17<sup>th</sup>, 2006

Aquí parte el tercer aspecto: ¿qué producen los alumnos y cómo es la calidad de su respuesta?, ¿existe interacción?, ¿se debe medir las respuestas del alumno cualitativamente o cuantitativamente? Es decir, bajo lo que quieren decir y el cómo lo hacen, o bajo la cantidad de palabras en su respuesta con un orden lógico y a su vez la cantidad de oraciones de esa respuesta. Aquí podemos contar también el tiempo de su respuesta y si ésta está fragmentada o no, ¿Cuántas veces se fragmenta y porqué? Etc. La última es el uso del español para entender el inglés (mal usado por cierto ya que aquí lo usamos para traducir). La diferencia está en cómo se interpreta la palabra inglesa en la oración. Tomemos ejemplos claros: *will* no traduce nada pero es el auxiliar para expresar actividades que ocurrirán en el futuro, que para el español guarda un estilo literario (traeré, jugaré). otro ejemplo es *could*, esto en si no es podría o pudo, con este se expresa posibilidad, permiso o habilidad hipotética, o bien, habilidades en el pasado que en el español se entiende como podría, podrías, podrían, podríamos, o podía, podías, podíamos podían hacer algo respectivamente. Cabe anotar también que muchas estructuras del inglés no tienen transferencia positiva y significativa al español, por ejemplo el futuro perfecto *I will have been working for 2 hours* no es en español “yo habré estado trabajando por 2 horas” sino “llevaré 2 horas trabajando” o “ya habré trabajado 2 horas”. Antes de referirme a los tres puntos principales de mi observación enfocada exclusivamente en los estudiantes y el lenguaje que se produce en el test, resultado de los classwork, el tipo y la calidad de input que se le ofrece al alumno, quisiera aclarar desde dónde entiendo mi análisis del test. Este lo hago desde lo que para el lenguaje y la interacción lo es todo, la competencia comunicativa (Hymes, 1960) que en una segunda lengua establece las condiciones que hacen posible compartir las interpretaciones del lenguaje, es decir, que durante el curso de la conversación, los hablantes de esa segunda lengua tienen que decidir qué omitir y qué agregar, o qué ya está establecido en el mensaje o qué es nuevo en él. Ahora, para saber cómo cada interacción individual tiene vida por sí misma en una conversación tenemos que detenemos a pensar sobre lo que el alumno no dijo pero pudo haber dicho de acuerdo al desarrollo de su conocimiento y habilidades aprendidas a nivel léxico, fonológico y sintáctico. Pero esta producción se compone, y a la vez se ve influenciada, por otras cuatro competencias: la gramatical que capacita al alumno en

<p>la organización de sus palabras dentro de una oración que esté acorde con la idea a expresar; la discursiva que es la habilidad que tiene el alumno de usar la competencia anterior para elaborar textos coherentes y cohesivos; la sociolingüística que muestra la habilidad para usar el lenguaje apropiadamente en diferentes contextos; y la más compleja de las cuatro, la competencia estratégica que revela cómo el alumno compensa las dificultades del lenguaje que produce y escucha para hacer un efectivo uso de él*.</p> <p>Lo anterior nos indica que el aprendizaje de un idioma debe ser estudiado en relación con el contexto social, en este caso Praxis, en el cual se produce y que los estudiantes deben aprenderlo con temas que colaboren y desarrollen su adquisición descubriendo la cohesión y coherencia en el discurso, por más simple que sea, y manteniendo siempre una dinámica conversacional.</p> <p>vAhora que ya está claro desde donde se mira el aprendizaje de un idioma y cómo éste debe ser funcional a nivel comunicativo y no estructural** presento a discusión los tres puntos principales del resultado de la observación sobre el desempeño oral de los estudiantes en test, en Galerías en la mañana, que a mi concepto influyen para que los estudiantes de Praxis se enmarquen únicamente en la primera de las 4 competencias anteriormente descritas mostrando una clara deficiencia a nivel discursivo, de dominio y estratégico del idioma inglés. Estos son la cantidad de input que se le ofrece al alumno fuente primordial de su output, la calidad de ese input que habilita el output del receptor y, el manejo del input y el output en los parámetros de interacción que los classwork activan.</p> <p>Cantidad de input: ésta activa el entendimiento de una lengua desde la comprensión (no traducción) del vocabulario, la sintaxis, y desde los aspectos fonológicos. Además reduce la distancia entre el aprendizaje de un tema y el periodo de silencio mientras promueve el desarrollo de la capacidad de habla del alumno. Por lo tanto estaremos de acuerdo que si no hay input significativo en buena cantidad no podremos esperar un buen output en suficiente cantidad de acuerdo al conocimiento adquirido hasta el momento. Quisiera aquí salirme por un momento del test para referirme a la cantidad de input de la clase. Esto nos servirá para entender el funcionamiento del classwork en test. La clase tiene buena cantidad de input cuando ésta logra, gracias a las habilidades del alumno y no del profesor pero si fomentadas por él, completar su ciclo de 15-30 teoría-práctica. El libro en si genera una entrada de palabras del ingles desde un vocabulario básico que activa inmediatamente el entendimiento del tema.</p>	<p>Posteriormente los classwork arrojan otra cantidad de palabras que cuando son significativas para el alumno se internalizan, pero cuando pierden esta relevancia, solamente sirven para ofrecer una respuesta inmediata que se queda en la memoria de corto plazo del estudiante, a la vez que activan el uso del monitor enfocándose únicamente en la gramática. Por ejemplo: En la pregunta 36 del classwork (CW) 9 “what am I doing?” los estudiantes preguntan “¿cómo se dice chapa?” mientras el profesor la gira. En la pregunta 8 del CW10 “does the blood flow in the veins?” el alumno escasamente alcanza a asociar los sonidos que oye mientras el profesor describe sobre su brazo el movimiento de la sangre por las venas. En la pregunta 10 del CW14 “don’t you think that’s a little too much for a pair of shoes?” el alumno se confunde con el juego de sonidos de la pregunta sin lograr distinguir las palabras separadamente. En la pregunta 9 del CW33 “who would Monique listen to if she spoke inside of an empty cave?” la situación para el estudiante se complica puesto que posiblemente distinga fonéticamente muchas de las palabras de la pregunta pero aun no logra juntarlas para armar la idea de la misma, a la vez, la extensión de la pregunta y su complejidad hacen que el estudiante se detenga a entender una por una las palabras olvidando al final de la pregunta y del proceso de entendimiento el significado de las palabras iniciales dando como resultado un bloqueo en la interacción. En la pregunta 35 del CW39 “while I (talk) to Mr. Franklin somebody walk into my office and (steal) the computer” el alumno se confunde al no entender cuales de los tres verbos de la pregunta debe convertir en el pasado perfecto o en el pasado progresivo ya que la situación en si es confusa, ¿yo hable primero con el Sr. Kennedy?, ¿el computador lo robaron antes de yo hablar con el señor Kennedy?, ¿los dos eventos ocurrieron al mismo tiempo? ¿Dónde estaba hablando con el señor Kennedy?, etc.</p> <p>En el test ocurre lo mismo con los classwork. No tiene objeto hacer en el test las mismas preguntas de la clase ni con el mismo orden ni en desorden. De la clase al test no se cumple el proceso de repetición significativa de la estructura para la adquisición puesto que en la clase es donde se aprende la forma de expresar alguna idea específica y luego, después de la practica situacional académica y personal, en el test se aplica esa estructura particular de la manera mas correcta posible y con la mejor combinación con lo aprendido anteriormente para demostrar que esa nueva estructura ha encajado en los parámetros de comunicación mentales del estudiante para expresar ideas en un rango mayor y mas lógico. En Galerías hay muchos</p>
--	--

alumnos que se han aprendido incluso muy cercanamente de memoria los classwork de beginners. Esto se nota cuando en el test me dan a conocer que yo no les había formulado tal u otra pregunta. También me ha ocurrido que el estudiante responde correctamente una pregunta a la que le he cambiado una palabra por otra en promedio no común pero incluida en el classwork (Ej. Kettle, screw, en CW11) sin lograr reportar que está diciendo al momento de preguntarle por el significado de las palabras cambiadas.

Otro uso de los classwork en test fue hacerles a los alumnos las mismas preguntas pero cambiándoles ciertas palabras base de cada oración. Por ejemplo en la pregunta 22 del CW16 “can you tell me how many cars there are in your house?” cambiarle *cars* por *universities*, *house* por Bogota, y omitirle *can you* formando así una oración imperativa. Para la pregunta 17 del CW21 “what’s in your opinion the best genre of music?” cambiarla por “what’s in your opinion the best movie of action?” Este hecho mostró que las preguntas funcionaban mejor y no mostraban una repetición de la clase más si una asociación con el tema y el mismo campo social del alumno. Es aquí cuando los alumnos haciendo uso del inglés como lenguaje de comunicación interactivo tratan de ampliar su respuesta, infortunadamente sin lograrlo. Por ejemplo un alumno respondió de la siguiente forma “the best movie for me is *La lista de Shindler*, ¡the movie is... muy buena, uy si! Tiene un tema buenísimo”. Este ejemplo muestra que el alumno frente a esta situación específica no tiene aun un enfoque comunicativo de lo aprendido ya que aquello que dijo en español comprende temas anteriores de los módulos 6, 10 y 18, pronombres posesivos, preferencias, y posesión, respectivamente. Otro ejemplo es un alumno en test 10 que a la pregunta “who do you live with at home” me consulta “¿qué es *who*?”, “quien”, respondo, y me dice “¿Quién que?”, yo digo “...live with you at home?”, “¡ah, sí! ¿Cómo digo primo?”. Para resaltar nuevamente, se presenta aquí deficiencia comunicativa para los módulos 7, 9 y el mismo 10, no fue significativo el tema de la familia, no hace uso del *who* para diálogos y su respuesta no expresa la acción *live*, respectivamente. Son muchos mas los ejemplos que puedo citar frente al no uso situacional del ingles como lenguaje de interacción los cuales muestran poco dominio de este a nivel comunicativo pero si gramatical en perfecto uso para aprobar un modulo en el salón de test.

La última prueba fue no usar las preguntas del classwork pero si preguntarles usando el tema de la clase. Por ejemplo, para el modulo 10 preguntar “talk about your daily

routine. What are the activities you do everyday?” Aproximadamente un 25% de los alumnos (no más de 15) realmente mostraron interacción al contar un promedio de 6 actividades diarias, otro 50% no pasaban de 2 actividades (entre las que se cuentan “I work” y “I study”) y el otro 25% me devolvían dudosamente una pregunta en español “¿Qué hago todos los días?” o simplemente no entendían. Otro ejemplo es, para el modulo 16, pedirles describir su cuarto de la casa; en este caso la mayoría llegaba en la respuesta hasta “there are...” y luego decían “¿cómo digo cama?” o mesita de noche, incluso closet, etc. Lo que muestra esta prueba efectuada en casi todos los módulos beginner y advanced, es que hay cierta asociación del tema de cada modulo con el contexto del alumno pero este no encuentra claro el uso correcto de la estructura como base lingüística para formar una idea a nivel interaccional.

En contraste con lo anterior, algo que realmente funciona en un 100% es el test grupal en el que diferentes estudiantes en diferentes módulos se encuentran en una sola sesión. Esto permite escuchar mas input que en ese momento se torna significativo para cada uno de los integrantes cumpliendo un papel de recordatorio de la ya visto o de “abrebocas” para lo que se verá. Sin embargo se debe especial atención cuando se encuentran varios de niveles muy avanzados con pocos de niveles muy bajos: no manejar apropiadamente esta situación puede causar un bloqueo comunicativo en los que poco conocimiento lingüístico del ingles tienen.

Los resultados expuestos anteriormente no tienen nada que ver ni con el manejo del método por parte del profesor de la clase -que forzado por la misma metodología se ha convertido en un simple repetidor de estructuras y pasos de la clase-, ni por los libros en si, sino más bien por la falta de material significativo de input tanto para la clase como para el trabajo en casa. Me refiero a temas cortos que abran conversaciones directas no extensas que permitan controlar la habilidad de manejar un dialogo interactivo, por ejemplo un problema para solucionarlo, un tema que discutir, un hecho que narrar, etc. Si en este momento no se está haciendo se debe a que los classwork no están en realidad diseñados para una interacción profesor-estudiante. Esto es notorio por dos motivos: Desde un principio las preguntas de estos classwork se compilaron con la única condición de que guardaran estrecha relación con la estructura gramatical del modulo; y que esas preguntas en su mayoría ni discurren sobre temas reales al mundo contextual del alumno ni se tejen lógicamente alrededor de un tema del todo interesante. Como muestra basta analizar la secuencia del CW26 de la pregunta 1 la 9. Se podría pensar que la pregunta 2 “did

<p>you travel last year?” es consecutiva a la pregunta 1 “Do you like to travel?”, pero mientras la número 1 demanda gustos la 2 pregunta por una acción en el pasado. Ninguna delimita la situación, es decir, ¿cómo viajar?, ¿a dónde?, ¿con quién?, ¿cuándo?, ¿el año pasado, pero cuándo específicamente?, ¿porqué? Ahora bien, para las preguntas 3 “have you been to China?” 4 “have you been abroad?”, 5 “What cities of Colombia have you been to?”, y 6 “when did you start studying at Praxis?” ¿Cómo se conecta China con las dos preguntas anteriores 1 y 2, y luego con Colombia, más aún Praxis?</p> <p>Otro material faltante son los reading diseñados respecto a la complejidad del modulo, estos que activan la connotación del vocabulario, la puesta en escena de estructuras, la interpretación de ideas y la fusión entre coherencia y cohesión en diálogos y narraciones. Por ejemplo párrafos informativos, literatura discursiva, lectura grafica con oraciones, lectura en no-prosa, etc.</p> <p>Una de las normas del test es hacer que el estudiante responda de la manera más extensa posible una pregunta para que practique la estructura. Además no se le debe permitir una gapped speaking y uso de muletillas. Se considera una respuesta correcta aquella que no tiene ninguno de estos “errores”. Esto lo defino como una presión al estudiante para que hable inmediatamente después del simple entendimiento de una estructura específica con un vocabulario que el alumno si al caso entiende y el cual no ha sido introducido, por lo tanto es simplemente ruido. Además la práctica de una sola estructura por un promedio de 40 minutos no es fuente de comunicación. Saber de una estructura y como se forma no es hablar con esa estructura. La presión que se le hace al estudiante desconoce el periodo silencioso que cada memoria posee después de la comprensión de un tema, desconoce el asimilamiento y procesamiento de la misma. Al mismo tiempo, la falta de comprensión de un mensaje (ruido) hace que el alumno se enfoque más en la forma y la estructura que en el mensaje, es decir la pregunta posee menos significado pero más gramática, y para el método, esto es contradictorio ya que este enseña comunicación y no lingüística. Por ultimo, la presión de hablar y el desconocimiento del vocabulario de las preguntas hacen que el alumno maneje una memoria de corto plazo, y peor aun, que se acostumbre a ella. El obstáculo que genera no entender una palabra hace que el alumno interrogue por ese significado y lo adicione a su respuesta únicamente para sobrepasar el impedimento lingüístico del momento, pero en realidad, esa nueva palabra no se internaliza, y se olvida al instante.</p>	<p>Existe además otro aspecto importante en el test que es consecuencia del método Praxis de la clase: la no contextualización de las estructuras y mensajes de cada modulo. Es claro que cualquier idioma se aprende interactuando, y en su esencia esto es lo que busca la metodología, pero infortunadamente el vocabulario de los classwork y los libros es infrecuente y descontextualizado. Debemos entender que aprender una estructura no es lo mismo que usarla en contexto, es decir una estructura internalizada debe ser practicada en diferentes contextos donde su realización es aceptada. El no manejo de parámetros de conversación en ingles conlleva a que el alumno hable solo para las clases y los test bajo la secuencia profesor pregunta y alumno responde “de la manera larga” con un mínimo porcentaje de error. Esto se ejemplifica en cada estudiante cuando en el test su objetivo, talvez inconsciente, es mostrarle al profesor que el maneja las estructuras, y no la conversación reciproca e interactiva. Como consecuencia, el intentar charlar en ingles y no poder hacerlo genera en los estudiantes desmotivación.</p> <hr/> <p>* Esta efectividad se manifiesta en frases sencillas pero llenas de sentido y correlación con el dialogo las cuales muestran un dominio del idioma y permiten la fluencia del dialogo. Por ejemplo “Lo que usted quiere decir es que si yo...”, “¿Cómo así? No le entiendo”, “Eso es lo que usted piensa pero yo creo que...”</p> <p>** Si lo hacemos a nivel estructural estamos asumiendo que todo el mundo aprende igual y al mismo ritmo. Además al hablar con una sola estructura la comunicación sufre y el input no se convierte en algo interesante para el alumno ya que este no lo contextualiza pero si se enfoca en la estructura particular promoviendo al hablar un uso excesivo del monitor mental que se enfoca en una estructura gramatical exclusiva oral.</p>
---	---

ANNEX No. 14	OBSERVATION No. 1
INSTITUTION: Summerhill School	DATE: February 17 <sup>th</sup> , 2005
GROUP: Teenager, 7th Grade, Social Studies	

OBJECTIVE OBSERVATION	SUBJECTIVE OBSERVATION
<p>The group's participation at the beginning of the class was limited regarding the English usage. The group did not interact orally among themselves and neither with the teacher during the first activity (brainstorming).</p> <p>Anyway they were forced to participate, their answers were short but they had ideas about the situation of Colombia after 1492 and it was possible to get to a concept of constitution thanks to some participation. The ideas were summarized in English and students took notes about them, <i>there were two times in which the teacher used Spanish to clarify some pieces of vocabulary.</i></p> <p><i>During the guide development the students asked for different words and structures so they could be able to answer and participate in class. There were as well some cases in which the teacher had to use Spanish to enhance comprehension about the constitution.</i></p>	<p>When the opinions and answers were socialized, most of the group showed comprehension and some students who did not participate before expressed at least a short idea.</p> <p>The group did not show security to express ideas in English except for the opinions of two students.</p> <p><i>It was necessary to clarify in Spanish the meaning of citizenship and commitment.</i></p> <p>Most of participation in English was forced by the teacher.</p> <p>Most of students participated in the final socialization of the class.</p>



ANNEX No. 15	OBSERVATION No. 2
INSTITUTION: Summerhill School	DATE: February 24 <sup>th</sup> , 2005
GROUP: Teenager, 7th Grade, Social Studies	

OBJECTIVE OBSERVATION	SUBJECTIVE OBSERVATION
<p>The class began 15 minutes later because the homeroom teacher asked for some time to talk with his students; <i>the contents given in this guide were denser than the ones before so that they demanded the interpretation of some graphics and the comprehension of more information.</i></p> <p>The first part of the class was very short because the students did not participate enthusiastically. Afterwards the reading became confused for most of the students, even though they had previous knowledge of the vocabulary used in the reading.</p> <p>The class was focused in the contents comprehension but it was not possible to get to a conscious knowledge about the common factors affecting contamination</p>	<p>Maybe the fact of their teacher scolding and shouting broke down the mood of the students.</p> <p>Students were not in the mood neither to talk nor to read or comprehend, so the teacher focused the class in the guide's comprehension.</p> <p><i>The Spanish usage along this class increased for about a 20% on respect to other classes.</i></p> <p>The objectives of the class were not accomplished at all.</p>

ANNEX No. 16	OBSERVATION No. 3
INSTITUTION: Thomas Jefferson School	DATE: March 9 <sup>th</sup> , 2005
GROUP: Teenager, 11 <sup>th</sup> grade b, English	

OBJECTIVE OBSERVATION	SUBJECTIVE OBSERVATION
<p>This class has been developed into a peaceful atmosphere, the students were realising who their new teacher was and so their silence and respect was notable.</p> <p>The language interaction along this class was totally in English, it was not necessary at any time to speak in Spanish, after the warming up the class turned around British cultural aspects and it seemed to be that they reached a good comprehension of the things explained, given the comparison they were able to do between Britain and Colombia.</p> <p>Some students showed advanced skills in spoken English, they talked clearly about the topics proposed while others remained quiet because of their lack of competence or knowledge of the topic.</p> <p>When the teacher asked for the participation of those who did not show security, they hesitated and made several mistakes in both, spoken and written language.</p>	<p>It was surprising for me to find a more real bilingual environment where English knowledge can truly be shaped.</p> <p>I thought the warming up exercise I proposed was going to be very difficult for them, but finally it was easy and even funny, it consisted of telling a story taking into account the letters and vowels of the alphabet.</p> <p>There was one student who spoke very well but presented a writing exercise with several mistakes that were not noticed by him until the feedback.</p> <p>The students forced to participate were able to make comprehensible output, even though they made several mistakes.</p>

ANNEX No. 17	OBSERVATION No. 4
INSTITUTION: Thomas Jefferson School	DATE: March 28 <sup>th</sup> , 2005
GROUP: Teenager, 11 <sup>th</sup> grade b, English	

OBJECTIVE OBSERVATION	SUBJECTIVE OBSERVATION
<p>Students were expecting to have a shorter listening, their organization in the classroom was changed to avoid cheating. Interaction of the students among themselves was in Spanish while lining up.</p> <p>The explanation of the exercise was not necessary, students wanted to start as soon as was possible because they had already lost 20 minutes while preparing an activity to honour the flag.</p> <p>The first part of the listening had to be repeated; so the noise made difficult the comprehension and the students asked for louder sound, but it was not possible.</p> <p>Many students asked for the explanation of many parts of the listening (in Spanish), most of the times the answers were given by the students with higher level of comprehension.</p>	<p>Eventhough the teacher interacts with his students only in English; they are not still used to do it among themselves.</p> <p>Students reading comprehension is good, so they understood clearly the instructions.</p> <p>It is difficult for the students to focus their attention in the listening, while there is any interference, what does not happen in Spanish.</p> <p>Students do not do any effort for comprehending the most difficult parts, their first option is always to ask somebody else but trying to understand by themselves.</p>

ANNEX No. 18	OBSERVATION No. 5
INSTITUTION: Thomas Jefferson School	DATE: April 7 <sup>th</sup> , 2005
GROUP: Teenager, 11 <sup>th</sup> grade b, English	

OBJECTIVE OBSERVATION	SUBJECTIVE OBSERVATION
<p>Students thought that the use of <i>a</i>, <i>an</i> and <i>zero</i> articles was easy and it was not necessary to study it again, any way the teacher showed 3 or 4 examples were they made a wrong use of them and so they noticed that they needed more knowledge to use them correctly.</p> <p>It was complex for them to identify in which situations the use of articles <i>like a, an, the, zero, etc.</i> is necessary. E.g. the French, a French, French people, the Mediterranean countries and many more.</p> <p>It was difficult for them to do a correct description of the city and its characteristics using the articles in the right way, they wrote mistakes like: <i>The home, a music, the Colombian people, just because they related the construction of the phrases with Spanish.</i></p>	<p>Students clearly established that the only rule that they knew about the use of the articles was that –a- was written before words starting by a consonant.</p> <p>They showed several weaknesses in the use of the articles, they even tried sometimes to compare it with the Spanish usage but they found themselves that some abstract things in our language are named with the articles regardless of their meaning.</p> <p>The students comprehension of these pieces of grammar was notable at the end of the when the writings they made were checked.</p>

ANNEX No. 19	OBSERVATION No. 6
INSTITUTION: Thomas Jefferson School	DATE: April 21 <sup>st</sup> , 2005
GROUP: Teenager, 11 <sup>th</sup> grade b, English	

OBJECTIVE OBSERVATION	SUBJECTIVE OBSERVATION
<p>At the beginning of the class the students showed comprehension of most of the vocabulary given in advantage. They had difficulties when they had to use it in the corresponding phrase because they did not recognize if they were nouns, verbs or adjectives.</p> <p>The text "To tip or not to tip" was difficult for them as far as they could not solve correctly the grammar exercises and the comprehension questions proposed by the text.</p> <p>Finally it was necessary for the teacher to explain to all the class the things that did not seem to be easily comprehended. Students immediately corrected their answer sheets.</p> <p>Eventhough, at the end of the class the topics appeared to be clearer, Students with low levels of proficiency did not participate in the general socialization.</p>	<p>Students used easily some synonyms, especially when they had the possibility to use them into a context. In other cases they made several mistakes and fell in the trick of false connate words.</p> <p>As soon as they started to fill the gaps they noticed that they did not know how to do it even when they recognized what synonyms the new words were for.</p> <p>It is good to do a general socialization of the answers since the students use the new words and expressions in different contexts and realize what their mistakes are,</p>

ANNEX No. 20	OBSERVATION No. 7
INSTITUTION: Thomas Jefferson School	DATE: April 14 <sup>th</sup> , 2005
GROUP: Teenager, 11 <sup>th</sup> grade b, English	

OBJECTIVE OBSERVATION	SUBJECTIVE OBSERVATION
<p>Students seemed to be interested in Whitman's poetry, they listened carefully to the explanations about his life and asked some questions about him, the teacher answered and tried to generate more interest by describing the epoch, and the main aspects of his life.</p> <p>Students read the three abstracts provided by the teacher, then the new vocabulary was highlighted and explained, and so the significance of each one of the extracts was studied.</p> <p>Little by little the student's attention spread off and it was difficult for the teacher to finish the explanations and give sense to the poems.</p> <p>Finally the teacher asked to the students to bring for next class a written report of the questions included in the copy they received taking into account they lack of</p>	<p>At the beginning of the class the novelty of the activity brought interest to the students as well as Walt Whitman's life, but, as soon as they started to read the poems and to comprehend the vocabulary, their attitude changed.</p> <p>When the students finished reading the paragraph, some of them said that they had not understood anything, but some of them (few) got interested in deducing the significance of the extracts.</p> <p>After trying to comprehend the poetry, most of the students with low English level did not show more interest in solving the questions, and by the time the teacher started the discussion, few people showed interest in decoding the information given.</p> <p>The language of poetry seemed to be complicated or boring for the students, few people showed comprehension or interest beyond the information given.</p>

ANNEX No. 21	OBSERVATION No. 8
INSTITUTION: Thomas Jefferson School	DATE: April 28 <sup>th</sup> , 2005
GROUP: Teenager, 11 <sup>th</sup> grade b, English	

OBJECTIVE OBSERVATION	SUBJECTIVE OBSERVATION
<p>Along this session the students were assessed in the topics corresponding to the first level of competence proposed by the school, this test was based on the vocabulary previously explained in class. <b>The class showed clearly that they did not have a clear idea of what a verb or a noun was. Besides, they said that they had not studied the workshop appropriately.</b></p> <p>Students asked several questions along the exam, they required examples for using the words and asked if their answers were correct or not.</p> <p><b>Many students tried to cheat when the teacher was distracted or helping somebody.</b></p>	<p>The assessment proposed by the school permits focusing evaluations on one out of all the aspects of English, but anyway the lack of study is remarkable since they were up to study only some peaces of vocabulary but they did not do it.</p> <p>Students are not sure of the usage they give to the supposed new words, <b>on the contrary they ask so often about the correctness of the phrases they do by themselves.</b></p> <p><b>Students try to cheat instead of asking for the meaning of the words they do not know, It is clear that they are not likely to show their lack of knowledge due to the common negative answers of the teacher,</b></p>

ANNEX No. 22	OBSERVATION No. 1
INSTITUTION: Geoffrey Chaucer's School	DATE: February 14th , 2005
GROUP: Children, Kindergarten Grade, English	

OBJECTIVE OBSERVATION	SUBJECTIVE OBSERVATION
<p>This is a beginners' level. This means that these children are just studying English vocabulary and some short sentences that let them express needs, ideas and make polite requests. They have learned vocabulary related to parts of the body, some space notions as 'up', 'down', 'left' and 'right'. They also recognize geometric shapes; items at school and numbers until 5.</p> <p>The expressions they already know are: 'may I go to the bathroom, please?' and 'please, tie my shoes'. They are able to answer basic questions like 'what's your name?' and 'what's this?'</p> <p>It is important to take into account that they are learning French too. So they're learning English as a second language.</p> <p>I started a new topic for them: "my house". I did it through vocabulary they already knew: the geometric shapes. So I asked them for the shapes I was drawing on the board. They said: triangle, circle and square. Then I asked them to do the same but taking into account the size: big square, small circle, etc. Then I gave each one a marker and they had to draw according to the instructions: "ok, let's draw a big square. Now a small circle, a big triangle... ok great". After this activity, I drew a house with the geometric shapes and I said: this is a house, what's this? And they answered "a house". After that, I gave them their notebooks and they drew a house similar to the one I did on the board.</p>	<p>Although the bits of language they were learning, kids enjoyed learning English that way. All of them tried to use the words they knew but just in the class moments. As they were a small group the teacher could dedicate enough time to each student in order to be sure of their vocabulary learning.</p> <p>The fact of learning two different languages at the same time was good for them, because they had the opportunity to compare, establish differences and similarities between them.</p> <p>In here it is deducible that teacher was trying to follow the meaningful learning approach. Starting by the vocabulary they already know, but not by that vocabulary that is interesting for them, for example: fairy tales, monsters, etc. Because they just use geometric shapes in maths class. So they don't have the opportunity to know different vocabulary related to their closer context.</p> <p>In this activity students demonstrated that they understand that input given by instructions.</p> <p>In here, the associated the sound /haus/ with the picture.</p>



ANNEX No. 23	OBSERVATION No. 2
INSTITUTION: Geoffrey Chaucer's School	DATE: February 21 <sup>st</sup> , 2005
GROUP: Children, Kindergarten Grade, English	

OBJECTIVE OBSERVATION	SUBJECTIVE OBSERVATION
<p>The class started at 10:40. Again I started to ask them to draw a house on the board. All of them drew it, so I thought they recognize it. Then I drew a bed, some toys, a bedside table and on it, a lamp.</p> <p>While I was drawing they were talking about the sponge Bob. I said: "silence please! Pay attention to me" and they looked at me. I asked them: <i>what do we have in our houses? Pronouncing houses with more intonation. They answered in Spanish: "¿Qué hay en mi casa? After I could say something, they started to say: 'cama', 'muñecos'.</i> Then one of the girls said: 'cuarto'. So I said: yes! A BEDROOM! A BEDROOM. And they repeated it: bedroom. I asked them again: what a bedroom has? It has a...? I pointed out the bed drew on the board. And they just wait for me to tell them how to say that in English. "Bed, that's a bed" and they repeated: bed! I asked: what else? A ... and they looked at me. So I decided to say all the words: a lamp, a bedside table and so on with the pics I had there. We repeated the words three times each one.</p> <p>After this, I gave them the guide with the same pictures. I asked them to point out where was the thing I was saying. "Bed", where is it? And they pointed it out. And so on with all the objects. Then they color the guide.</p>	<p>To draw the word the teacher is asking for is not guarantee of acquisition but of comprehension. Because they're not using that word in any different context just when they're asked to say it o recognize it in a picture.</p> <p><i>They are showing the necessity of translating the target language into their mother tongue, in order to be sure of what they understood.</i></p> <p>They are used to repeat words even if they are not told to do so.</p> <p>It is clear that the objective for students is just to learn specific vocabulary. The input given by the teacher here is not enough to involve them in a L2 acquisition, so that they fall back into L1 easily.</p> <p>Although this minimal input given, students demonstrate they like learning these words. They memorized this vocabulary in spite of not using it frequently. They used to compete among them in order to know who the person more words know is.</p>

ANNEX No. 24	OBSERVATION No. 3
INSTITUTION: Melanie Klein School	DATE: February 14 <sup>th</sup> , 2006
GROUP: Children, First grade English	

OBJECTIVE OBSERVATION	SUBJECTIVE OBSERVATION
<p>In the class We reviewed the items at school and specifically those ones we commonly use in the classroom every day.</p> <p>I gave them a guide in which there were pictures of things like scissors, book, ruler, etc. They had to color the drawings and cut out the pics to paste them on their notebooks. As they were doing this, they had the necessity to ask for things they did not have, as glue or stick. So, I told them the expression for making that request: could you lend me your... Please?</p> <p>In that moment, most of them started to say the expression, but they didn't use the words in English. So they said: Could you lend me your "Tijeras" please? Just two students did it right, with the word in English.</p> <p>The class finished with this activity.</p>	<p>These students have no had an intense English learning process.</p> <p>I could see that they knew these words, but they don't use them.</p> <p>The idea of this activity was to create that need to speak in English and use the words they know in the school context.</p> <p>They were worried about the expression so that they forgot to use the words.</p>

ANNEX No. 25	OBSERVATION No. 4
INSTITUTION: Melanie Klein School	DATE: February 17 <sup>th</sup> , 2006
GROUP: Children, First grade English	

OBJECTIVE OBSERVATION	SUBJECTIVE OBSERVATION
<p>Escuchamos la primera canción del libro "Rainbow". Los que aún no tenían el libro se sintieron un poco incómodos, pero mi intención no era iniciar con el libro sino practicar los saludos y preguntas sencillas como "what's your name". Lo que quería era familiarizarlos más con el idioma, hacerlo más constante y más cotidiano para ellos, empezando por las cosas primordiales.</p> <p>Se aprendieron la canción de "hello" "how are you" "fine thank you" "and you?", además la actuaron sin recibir instrucción de hacerlo: Un niño se levantó de su puesto y sin más se salió y volvió en seguida diciendo: "Good morning, how are you?" y todos respondieron "fine thank you" y él les dijo: "tienen que decir "and youuu?"</p> <p>Siguiendo por la línea de cómo contestar cuando te dicen "how are you". <b>Les dije en inglés que uno no siempre podía estar bien, sino que enfermo o triste también, pero vi en sus caras que no me entendían, entonces les dije en español.</b></p> <p>Para esto, les pasé un recortable que traía dos caritas de un mico que estaba feliz y otro triste. Les pregunté ¿how do you say when you're ....? E hice una gran sonrisa. Algunos dijeron "feliz" y otro niño me dijo, "no sabemos teach." Así que les dije: "ok, we say happy in English, do you see the monkey's smile? (mientras les hacía gestos) y ellos respondían: siiiii... how is it? Happy (sonreía) or sad (hacia gesto triste), ellos respondieron: happy!</p> <p>Les di una nueva instrucción: Now, we're going to say how are we? If you're happy, paste first the monkey that is happy, if you're sad, paste first the sad monkey. De acuerdo al estado de ánimo de ese momento, la mayoría pegó the happy monkey y no contestaron nada, sólo lo recortaron y pegaron. La clase terminó coloreando los dibujos.</p>	<p>These first graders haven't had an L2 environment at all. They had not have listened to a person speak all the time in English, so that was new for them.</p> <p>I could see that they already knew the vocabulary related to items at school, but they don't use them, this is the reason why this activity was thought to create the need to speak in English and use the words they know in the school context. <i>As they see the teacher speaking in English all time, they tried to speak less in Spanish, but most of them opted not speak during the class. (silent period)</i></p> <p>At the same time they are showing an interest on developing speaking skills, practicing with basic expressions, greetings and vocabulary.</p> <p>In this moment I thought if they don't know how to say happy, less they're going to answer me that same question for sad.</p> <p><i>Now, they are trying to listen carefully in order to understand what is being said.</i></p>

ANNEX No. 26	OBSERVATION No. 5
INSTITUTION: Melanie Klein School	DATE: March 22 <sup>nd</sup> , 2006
GROUP: Children, First grade English	

OBJECTIVE OBSERVATION	SUBJECTIVE OBSERVATION
<p>This was a 40 minutes English class. It started giving some instructions to fold a color paper in order to do diamond-shaped. When they finished doing it, they had to write on each end the family members. In spite of watching at the correct writing, they wrote as the word sounds: fader, moder and broder. I asked them to write the family members correctly and they just smiled so it was like funny to commit these mistakes for them, because when they realized of the error they said “¡uy estaba más mal!”</p> <p>In order to remain the writing of the words they already know, I gave them sixteen pieces of paper where they had to write the word I said, for example: one, green, father, etc... the vocabulary practiced here was about colors, number and family. We spend too much time giving the small papers and writing, so we just wrote 5 words: orange, one, brother, five and sister. When all of them, had written the five words, I started to say each one and they had to show it, if it was correct they had a point. Just 4 students got the 5 points.</p>	<p>A 40 minutes class is not enough to work with each student even more if the group is big.</p> <p>Children were concentrated in order to understand the instructions to fold the paper, but they put specially attention to the way the teacher was folding the paper rather than on what they were hearing.</p> <p>While they were writing the teacher was saying the words, so most of them tried to write in the way the word sounds and they did not looked at the board to check them.</p> <p><i>In the last activity they had lots of fun! Because in the moment of writing the word most of them wrote it wrong, but when the teacher asked for each word they show the correct one, for example: teacher called “brother”, and they showed in the paper “broder”.</i></p>

ANNEX No. 27	OBSERVATION No. 6
INSTITUTION: Melanie Klein School	DATE: May 15 <sup>th</sup> , 2006
GROUP: Children, First grade English	

OBJECTIVE OBSERVATION	SUBJECTIVE OBSERVATION
<p>Most of the students listened carefully to the teacher. She explained everything in English giving short instructions and speaking slowly: “We are going to look at the pictures we have in the papers” then we are going to read what the chant tell us about the monsters, do you see the monsters? Yes.. How many monsters do you see? They didn’t understand the question, so she gave a number. Ten? Five? Students say no (Spanish accent) “dos”. So, she repeated the question: how many? And students answer “two”. A student said “ahh two monsters”.</p> <p>Then they read the sentences that described the pictures: “monsters, monsters jumping up and down, Jumping all around, they’re climbing on the sofa, they’re eating all the cookies...etc.” Students read not caring about word’s pronunciation at all. Then teacher asked. What are the monsters doing? Some of them said “jumping”.. what else? Sofa... cookies. So teacher helped them: eating cookies, good!. “Now you’re going to circle the actions you can see in the reading. They circled the verbs correctly. At the end they practiced the pronunciation following the chant’s lyrics.</p> <p>This way the present progressive tense was practiced.</p>	<p>When the teacher was speaking all of them were in silence. <i>At this time, students demonstrate that they understand more than before they did. I could infer it because of their faces. They do not look like if they were hearing an alien.</i></p> <p>There is more input given than before and the teacher tries to make it comprehensible for students helping them with gestures or known vocabulary, because that’s way they arrived to the answers.</p> <p>While they were reading the teacher corrected the pronunciation and the others students who were not reading aloud corrected themselves at the same time.</p> <p>They understand what the actions are easily because they’re studying the same topic in Spanish.</p> <p>They’re good at singing in English; they got the pronunciation of words so fast.</p>

ANNEX No. 28	OBSERVATION No. 7
INSTITUTION: Melanie Klein School	DATE: August 17 <sup>th</sup> , 2006
GROUP: Children, First grade English	

OBJECTIVE OBSERVATION	SUBJECTIVE OBSERVATION
<p>The class started saying the every day prayer that we always do in Spanish, but this time we did it in English, so students repeated what they heard, doing the same expressions they always do, when they're praying. They closed their eyes and put their hands together.</p> <p>Today they are going to present the second English examination, so I started giving them the exams and then I explained each part at the same time they had to do it. "First you're going to write the expression that best describes pictures. (I love... I prefer... I like... I don't like). Some of them understood but some others not, so I repeated "you have to write" (making gestures), and they said "ahhh... tenemos que escribir." Yes you have to. While some students were writing, one of them asked me. Teacher pero como escribo "I don't like" (with good pronunciation). So I give examples, making gestures, "I love chicken" and I wrote it on the board, and so on with the rest of the expressions. Then all of them understood and did it correctly. When all finished, we went to the 2nd part. "Read and draw". It was a short description of a monster. We read it all together aloud, and they easily understood what they had to do, as they recognized vocabulary related to parts of the body and colors. While they were coloring and drawing, some of them came to me and asked "teacher así? And I answered yes, but look (pointing) where are the ears? And they say ¡ahhh me falta! And so on with the missing parts.</p> <p>After fifteen minutes we started with the third part. I read the instruction, then I explained: you have to write what is the action each animal is doing. For example, look at the cat, do you see the cat? Yes! Ok, what is the cat doing? The cat is... and they said sleeping. Good! That's it. That's what you have to do with each animal.</p> <p>When they started to associate the actions with the animals, they didn't recognize the names of the animals. So they got confused especially with horse, turtle and frog. Also they started to ask "teacher qué es /eatin/? And I answered them pronouncing it</p>	<p>Probably they didn't know what was exactly they were saying, but they pronounced each word as we do when we pray.</p> <p>They have developed a good listening skill, because at the beginning of the year, they asked me to repeat in Spanish the instructions given. But, at the same time, they haven't feel ready to produce in English, because is noticeable that most of their interaction is in their mother tongue, even if they are talking to the teacher.</p> <p>They are able to answer yes / no questions.</p> <p>Sometimes it is pretty difficult for them to read in English, because they tend to do it as if they were reading in Spanish, so they can not associate what they are hearing with the mental image of the word. For example, they perfectly understand and recognize what is "eat", but because of the bad pronunciation they did not have the slightest idea what was that word.</p>

correctly /i: tɪŋ/, at the same time I pointed the flashcard that shows a man eating. In that moment another student came and told the other: ¡no sabe qué es eso, eso es comer! The same student asked me “¿teacher qué es frog”? So I asked him, how many green animals can you see? He didn't say a thing, he just pointed the turtle, so I said, no, that's turtle, and he said: ahh ya entendí es rana, ¿cierto? I answered yes that's a frog. At the end a student asked me “teacher no entiendo qué es /orse/” and I said: you don't understand because it's not orse/ but /h... and he said yes, teacher pero ¿cuál animal es? Ok, I said, do you remember woody? He said yes, ok who was his best friend? Ahh el caballo, he answered. I confirmed saying, yes that's a horse. The child said, ahh thank you teacher.

I asked all, are you about to finish? Some of them said nooo. And some others, answered yes teacher, I finished.

## Annex 29

### Category 1: Referential Meaning

Group	Example	Interpretation
Adults	<p>Annex 1, October 1, 2004</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Vocabulary was not really a trouble since they had dictionaries and they could look unknown words up.</li> <li>- Most of the questions they asked me were to know the meaning of unknown words, for instance, "What's pamphlet?"</li> </ul>	<p>Students use dictionaries to know the meaning of unknown words so that they will be able to understand the whole sentence.</p> <p>When they do not use the dictionary, probably they do not have one, they simply ask the teacher for unknown words, teacher is a source of meaning.</p>
	<p>Annex 2, October 2, 2004</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- However, after explaining various meanings to them, they started understanding more and more.</li> <li>- Questions they asked me were about meaning of unknown words; in addition, they asked me for how to say particular words in English, for instance, "¿Cómo digo los pamphlets <i>que llegan a la casa?</i>"</li> </ul>	<p>Referential meaning helps students improve listening by simply knowing the meaning of an EL word.</p> <p>Not only referential meaning takes place from English to Spanish, but also vice versa. It contributes to students' increasing stock of vocabulary</p>
	<p>Annex 4, October 15, 2004</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I was asked about technical vocabulary of the ads we had not contemplated before. Those questions were made part in English, and when they didn't know an English language word, in Spanish, e.g. "What is 'leaflet'?" "¿Cómo digo 'catálogo'?"</li> </ul>	<p>Students not only ask about words in their material but also come up with words related to it and useful to express properly. They usually ask for an EL word meaning in English and for an SL word translation in Spanish.</p>
	<p>Annex 5, February 18, 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The amount of Spanish used is levelled at 20% since the questions they used Spanish were about vocabulary, for instance, "Teacher, what is <i>town</i>? What is <i>jungle</i>? Qué es <i>bush</i>?)... But when one of them understood just said the word in Spanish ("ah! <i>pueblo</i>), queerly waiting for my confirmation.</li> </ul>	<p>Knowing the precise meaning of a word is necessary for the student to understand a question in a whole; without it, the student will simply not understand the question and will not provide a correct answer. Again, the teacher becomes the student's source of meaning.</p>
	<p>Annex 6, February 26, 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Questions in Spanish were made</li> </ul>	<p>In this situation, referential meaning is</p>



	<p>to verify the lexicon items in English, for example, "<i>more than</i>" es "<i>más que</i>", cierto?" As seen the question was made in Spanish, they however needed confirmation in their mother tongue to comprehend and understand English a lot.</p> <p>Annex 7, February 26, 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Since she asked me "what is this?" or "Esto es <i>pueblo</i>?"</li> <li>- They cleared each other their own doubts in Spanish.</li> </ul> <p>Annex 12, March 18, 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Students for vocabulary (score 9). "Teacher qué es <i>layover</i>?" "No entendí que era <i>owner</i>?"</li> <li>- Students to explain what was done in the homework (score 7). "Bueno, yo quise decir que ellos no eran sus dueños."</li> <li>- Students to confirm questions made by the teacher (score 7). "¿Que si yo he viajado fuera del país?"</li> <li>- Among students to clarify teacher's questions (score 5). "Que a qué hora te despiertas."</li> <li>- Students to clarify uses and concepts of English (score 5). "O sea que sólo uso <i>there will be</i> para futuro en singular y plural."</li> <li>- Students to explain previous activities (score 4). "Es que yo no vine ayer al test, solo a la clase."</li> <li>- Students to ask for repetition (score 4). "¿Me repites por favor?"</li> <li>- Students to confirm questions made by another person different from the teacher (score 1). "¿Qué dijo, qué si era enfermera?"</li> </ul> <p>Annex 13, May 16 to June 17, 2006</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- En la pregunta 36 del classwork (CW) 9 "what am I doing?" los estudiantes preguntan "¿cómo se dice chapa?" mientras el profesor la gira.</li> </ul>	<p>necessary for the student to verify his own knowledge. It reinforces his mind concepts. The student's use of Spanish is a common pattern when the student needs meaning of EL words.</p> <p>The students typically use the first question while pointing out an EL word on one of the pages of their textbooks, and the second one to clarify their knowledge of EL words meanings.</p> <p>Students do not frequently use English among them to communicate ideas.</p> <p>This list of these situations demonstrates that students perform differently on varied co-texts. They look for any help (regularly the teacher, or a classmate, or a dictionary) to get the meaning of the unknown word. The use or not of Spanish is a proof that overpasses the student's linguistic level because of lexical items meanings are the priority over demonstration of speaking skill.</p> <p>Again referential meaning plays its role when the student needs the EL word of the thing pointed out. It is simply to complete utterances correctly.</p>
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Otro ejemplo es un alumno en test 10 que a la pregunta "who do you live with at home" me consulta "¿qué es <i>who</i>?", "quien", respondo, y me dice "¿Quién que?", yo digo "...live with you at home?", "¡ah, sí! ¿Cómo digo primo?"</li> <li>- El otro 25% me devolvían dudosamente una pregunta en español "¿Qué hago todos los días?" o simplemente no entendían. Otro ejemplo es, para el modulo 16, pedirles describir su cuarto de la casa; en este caso la mayoría llegaba en la respuesta hasta "there are..." y luego decían "¿cómo digo cama?" o mesita de noche, incluso closet, etc.</li> <li>- Por ejemplo "Lo que usted quiere decir es que si yo...", "¿Cómo así? No le entiendo", "Eso es lo que usted piensa pero yo creo que..."</li> </ul>	<p>A chain of unknown words cuts out interaction by turning the conversation into a questionnaire for vocabulary.</p> <p>These are other examples for Knowing the precise meaning of a lexical item to understand a question in a whole; without it, the student will simply not understand the question and will not provide a correct answer. Again, the teacher becomes the student's source of meaning.</p>
--	--	---

Group	Example	Interpretation
Teenagers	<p>Annex 14, February 17th, 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There was two times in which the teacher used Spanish to clarify some pieces of vocabulary.</li> <li>- During the guide development the students asked for different words and structures so they could be able to answer and participate in class. There were as well some cases in which the teacher had to use Spanish to enhance comprehension about the constitution.</li> <li>- It was necessary to clarify in Spanish the meaning of citizenship and commitment.</li> </ul>	<p>Students do not try to make themselves understand throughout English, they commonly try at the very first time to use Spanish as the best mean for understanding.</p> <p>Sometimes the lack of capacity for the students to communicate in English also forces the teacher to use Spanish in order to promote some participation of those who do not feel sure about themselves.</p>
	<p>Annex 15, February 24, 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The contents given in this guide</li> </ul>	<p>There is a time when students with low levels of understanding do not ask any more about meanings whether in English or in Spanish so that the teacher finally makes himself clear by using native lexicon.</p> <p>Inasmuch as the complexity of written information increases, it is more common</p>

	<p>were denser than the ones before so that they demanded the interpretation of some graphics and the comprehension of more information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Spanish usage along this class increased for about a 20% on respect to other classes.</li> </ul> <p>Annex 17, March 28, 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Many students asked for the explanation of many parts of the listening (in Spanish), most of the times the answers were given by the students with higher level of comprehension.</li> </ul> <p>Annex 21, April 28, 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Students asked several questions along the exam, they required examples for using the words and asked if their answers were correct or not.</li> <li>- On the contrary they ask so often about the accuracy of the phrases they do by themselves.</li> </ul>	<p>for the students to use Spanish lexicon in order to reach comprehension.</p> <p>Listening time is one of the moments where students ask for referential meaning the most and so it has been in these moments when the teacher has also used Spanish accordingly.</p> <p>Assessment time shows specially a use of Spanish lexicon in order to insure the rightness of their written English language, but given the denial of the teacher to use Spanish, they are forced to do it in English so that instead of asking immediately in Spanish they just ask whether if what they have done is correct or not.</p>
--	--	--

Group	Example	Interpretation
Children	<p>Annex 23, February 21, 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Teacher asked them: what do we have in our houses? Pronouncing houses with more intonation. They answered in Spanish: "¿Qué hay en mi casa? After I could say something, they started to say: 'cama', 'muñecos'.</li> </ul> <p>Annex 22, February 14, 2006</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Teacher asked them for the geometric shapes she was drawing on the board. They said: triangle, circle and square, with good</li> </ul>	<p>Children are showing the necessity of translating the target language into their mother tongue, in order to be sure of what they understood.</p> <p>Students demonstrated that they understand that input given by instructions despite they do not express it in English</p>

	<p>pronunciation. Then I asked them to do the same but taking into account the size: big square, small circle, etc. Then the teacher gave each one a marker and they had to draw according to the instructions: "ok, let's draw a big square. Now a small circle, a big triangle... ok great".</p> <p>Annex 24, February 14, 2006</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I gave them a guide in which there were pictures of school supplies. They had to color these drawings and cut out them and paste them on their notebooks. As they were doing this, they had the necessity to ask for things they did not have, as glue or stick. So, I told them the expression for making that request: could you lend me your... Please?</li> <li>- In that moment, most of them started to say the expression, but they didn't say the words they needed in English. So they said: Could you lend me your "Tijeras" please?</li> </ul> <p>Annex 25, February 17, 2006</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Se aprendieron la canción de "hello" "how are you" "fine thank you" "and you?", además la actuaron sin recibir instrucción de hacerlo: Un niño se levantó de su puesto y sin más se salió y volvió en seguida diciendo: "Good morning, how are you?" y todos respondieron "fine thank you" y él les dijo: "tienen que decir "and youuu?"</li> </ul> <p>Annex 25, February 17, 2006</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- La teacher les dio un recortable que traía dos caritas de un mico que estaba feliz y otro triste. Les preguntó ¿how do you say when you're ....? E hizo una gran sonrisa. Algunos dijeron "feliz" y otro niño le dijo, "no sabemos teach." Así que les dijo: "ok, we say happy in English, do you see</li> </ul>	<p>or even in Spanish, but doing correctly what they are told to do.</p> <p>Students could not associate a new expression to their previous knowledge. In this case, they were more concentrated on expressing themselves with the new polite request, forgiving its purpose.</p> <p>Students enjoy learning English songs and they do not get confuse when mixing L1 with L2 at the same time.</p> <p>If they are really encouraged to learn the lyrics, they will do it. However, to achieve this, they use Spanish.</p> <p>Most of the time children use Spanish to negotiate the meaning of words or sentences. When teacher speaks in English they answer in Spanish. The few words students say in English is because they just listened to them or because they were asked to repeat.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>the monkey's smile? (Mientras les hacía gestos) y ellos respondían: siiiii... how is it? Happy (sonreía) or sad (hacia gesto triste), ellos respondieron: happy!</p>	
--	---	--

## Annex 30

### Category 2: Failure

Group	Example	Interpretation
Adults	<p>Annex 1, October 1, 2004</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- For two students, a man and a woman, this situation let them down a bit because they hoped to understand more.</li> </ul> <p>Annex 2, October 2, 2004</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- When I spoke about my comprehension ideas, some students neither accept nor contradict them and just let the others participate - those ones who usually speak in class. I'm sure they didn't do that because they didn't understand much of the reading but just because they didn't know how to express their own ideas; when they tried to say something about the topic they just gave up speaking by commonly saying "No, teacher, nothing."</li> </ul> <p>Annex 6, February 26, 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- On the other hand, they could not express many ideas due to lack of useful vocabulary. At these moments I decided to paraphrase the original question for another easier to comprehend. I sensed they felt a lot disappointed at not being able to answer the original question.</li> </ul> <p>Annex 7, February 26, 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- When I had them read the dialogue and answer my questions for understanding, I started realizing the young woman had problems with vocabulary. I pushed her to use English at least to make me the questions but she just said she couldn't do it because she did not know how to... I also pushed them to use English, but in the end they gave up as well and used Spanish to give the meaning of a sentence or word.</li> </ul>	<p>Some students just think they will be able to handle a structure because they have already studied it, but when they realize the structure can take place in another unseen co-text they refrain from speaking.</p> <p>Failure is not always being unable to acquire a language in a whole, but also being unable to express own ideas in the way it is wanted by using current knowledge. The student can probably understand what the teacher is saying but can not actually respond to the interaction demanded.</p> <p>This example shows how the lack of knowledge of an unknown word stops the student speaking. It is a mixture of looking for referential meaning and failure. Without the meaning of a word, communication is cut out.</p> <p>This situation is similar to the previous one. The lack of vocabulary causes the student to remain silent. In other words, failure to express ideas.</p>

	<p>Annex 8, February 28, 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Except for teenagers. They couldn't understand so well my examples until I used Spanish as an understanding tool ("Yo había ido"). After that they finally understood and could quite give me some examples, but they were missing of vocabulary, verbs in the past and past participle express properly.</li> <li>- I could notice they weren't able to communicate their feelings in English despite they wanted to; because of they did not know what and how to say in those situations.</li> </ul> <p>Annex 11, March 11, 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- They confused <i>his</i> with <i>he's</i>, and because of this, their answers were wrong and incomprehensible. And not only this, <i>her</i>, with <i>she</i>, <i>hers</i>.</li> </ul> <p>Annex 12, March 18, 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- When the teacher only uses English for communication, students feel lack of confidence; they get nervous and can't interact.</li> <li>- The students' lack of vocabulary cuts off their communication.</li> <li>- If you are speaking in English and your mind remains quite blanc at the moment of looking for the fit word to complete your idea, you have to recur to a strategy of conveying meaning. If not, you just express the concept in Spanish.</li> <li>- When teacher cuts off students' speaking, it creates gaps into which teacher's comments are not clearly understood by them leading the students fail when trying to resume their speaking.</li> </ul> <p>Annex 13, May 16 to June 17, 2006</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- En la pregunta 9 del CW33 "who would Monique listen to if she spoke inside of an empty cave?" la situación para el estudiante se complica puesto que posiblemente distinga fonéticamente muchas de</li> </ul>	<p>This situation relates to failure since the students could not understand the teacher's explanation until he used Spanish to transfer from SL grammatical structure to EL one and to make the student understand what was being explained. Without this transfer process, the student was unable to express ideas by using the structure.</p> <p>Again, the lack of enough lexical items to express ideas causes failure to communicate.</p> <p>Despite the students used English, it was not saying what they thought. Here, failure causes misunderstanding.</p> <p>These examples show failure as a consequence of lack of vocabulary to understand the other's utterance or to interact with him. It causes the student to fall back on Spanish to hold interaction.</p> <p>In some particular situations, the teacher's complex utterances make the student deviate from his original idea. This event as well makes the student overthink what is going to be expressed; thus, he will fall back on Spanish if necessary.</p> <p>If the student is asked with these complex questions at a level he is not yet ready to understand, he will necessarily use his mother tongue to understand the question; therefore, failure to comprehend takes place, then the student will be unable to</p>
--	---	---

	<p>las palabras de la pregunta pero aun no logra juntarlas para armar la idea de la misma, a la vez, la extensión de la pregunta y su complejidad hacen que el estudiante se detenga a entender una por una las palabras olvidando al final de la pregunta y del proceso de entendimiento el significado de las palabras iniciales dando como resultado un bloqueo en la interacción.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- También me ha ocurrido que el estudiante responde correctamente una pregunta a la que le he cambiado una palabra por otra en promedio no común pero incluida en el classwork (Ej. Kettle, screw, en CW11) sin lograr reportar que está diciendo al momento de preguntarle por el significado de las palabras cambiadas.</li> <li>- Es aquí cuando los alumnos haciendo uso del inglés como lenguaje de comunicación interactivo tratan de ampliar su respuesta, infortunadamente sin lograrlo. Por ejemplo un alumno respondió de la siguiente forma "the best movie for me is <i>La lista de Shindler</i>, ¡the movie is... muy buena, uy si! Tiene un tema buenísimo".</li> <li>- Por ejemplo, para el modulo 10 preguntar "talk about your daily routine. What are the activities you do everyday?" Aproximadamente un 25% de los alumnos (no más de 15) realmente mostraron interacción al contar un promedio de 6 actividades diarias, otro 50% no pasaban de 2 actividades (entre las que se cuentan "I work" y "I study") y el otro 25% me devolvían dudosamente una pregunta en español "¿Qué hago todos los días?" o simplemente no entendían. Otro ejemplo es, para el modulo 16, pedirles describir su cuarto de la casa; en este caso la mayoría llegaba en la respuesta hasta "there are..." y luego decían "¿cómo digo cama?" o mesita de noche, incluso closet, etc.</li> </ul>	<p>interact.</p> <p>Despite the student utters the sentence, he does not exactly know what he is saying. Failure counts for a misconceived utterance.</p> <p>In this situation, the students try to interact by using English unsuccessfully simply because they do not yet have enough lexical items to do it.</p> <p>Lack of vocabulary causes failure to communicate.</p>
--	---	--





	asking for the meaning of the words they do not know, It is clear that they are not likely to show their lack of knowledge due to the common negative answers of the teacher.	the tools they use the most in order to get that purpose.
--	---	---

Group	Example	Interpretation
Children	<p>Annex 25, February 17, 2006</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- La teacher les dijo en inglés que no siempre podían estar bien, sino que enfermo o triste también, pero vio que los niños estaban haciendo gestos de que no habían entendido, entonces perdieron el interés y unos empezaron a dibujar en las mesas o en los cuadernos, entonces les explicó de nuevo en español, y en ese momento todos la escucharon y siguieron con la actividad de colorear.</li> </ul>	<p>Children decided to give up and did not try to understand what was being said, until they hear their teacher speaking in Spanish.</p> <p>Probably the stage for motivation was not the best and that affected the students.</p>

## Annex 31

### Category 3: Interference

Group	Example	Interpretation
Adults	Annex 2, October 2, 2004 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I deduce she usually speaks in English from Mother tongue grammatical structure since she says Spanish-structure-like English sentences like "My mother and your (her) friend were in (at) the supermarket (the day) before yesterday" or "we comes (venimos) to Praxis for (to) study English" or "the people is (are) very nice."</li> </ul>	It is noticeable that the student here uses the wrong possessive adjective for "she" by transferring from "su" of Spanish to "your" of English. She also omits "the day" for the time expression "the day before yesterday" because it is said "antes de ayer" in Spanish. Finally, she uses the determined article "the" and matches wrongly "people" with "is" just because it is "la gente es" in Spanish.
	Annex 5, February 18, 2005 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Two girls had problems with sentence structure, they confused the location of adverbials for place with adverbials for time, e.g. "there were in my kitchen 2 apples yesterday" or "In my house there are two bathrooms."</li> </ul>	This is an example that clearly shows Spanish sentence structure interference in an EL sentence.
	Annex 11, March 11, 2005 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I had to repeat slowly and emphasizing on the structure –order- of the sentences since in their answers they mistook frequently by using Spanish-like order (e.g. "the book is of he" or "is of she"</li> <li>- They thought they both were the same and their answers were like "his (he's) brother of she (hers)", "her (she) is his brother." I didn't write anything of this on the board but just repeated their answers correctly to let them repeat them accurately. Another problem was the confusion between <i>his/her</i> and <i>your</i>, "this is your (her) pencil" or "your (his) name is Luke"</li> </ul>	In these two examples, the believing of personal pronouns form usage within any position in an EL sentence is a common mistake in EFL students since it can be done in Spanish. As well as the omission of them like it is commonly done in Spanish. These EL structures take the EFL student quite long time to handle.
	Annex 12, April 9, 2005 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In this exercise they had a lot of mistakes of sentence structure, it was Spanish-like, e.g. "is in the table" when the correct answer was "it is on</li> </ul>	When students are usually beginning learning English, it is frequently seen these mistakes of Spanish-like sentence structure into EL utterances.

	the table." Or "in front of the board is the teacher."	
--	--	--

Group	Example	Interpretation
Teenagers	<p>Annex 18, April 7, 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It was complex for them to identify in which situations the use of articles like a, an, the, zero, etc. is necessary. E.g. the French, a French (French people), the Mediterranean countries and many more.</li> <li>- It was difficult for them to do a correct description of the city and its characteristics using the articles in the right way, they wrote mistakes like: The home, a music, the Colombian people, just because they related the construction of the phrases with Spanish.</li> <li>- They showed several weaknesses in the use of the articles, they even tried sometimes to compare it with the Spanish usage but they found themselves that some abstract things in our language are named with the articles regardless of their meaning.</li> </ul> <p>Annex 19, April 21, 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Students used easily some synonyms, especially when they had the possibility to use them into a context. In other cases they made several mistakes and fell in the trick of false connate words.</li> </ul>	<p>It is clear that Spanish is the first communicative reference they have to understand input and produce some output, even though students did not use much Spanish in this class, the way they internalize the L2 based on L1 was very notorious.</p> <p>Beyond the number of times that any apprentice uses Spanish to comprehend English, L1 seems to be internally even more used than what teachers are aware of.</p> <p>L1 lack of knowledge of lexical components interferes in L2 lexicon learning, given the assignment of wrong functions to different words or using a wrong form at the time students write or speak.</p>

Group	Example	Interpretation
Children	<p>Annex 27, May 15, 2006</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Teacher: We are going to look at the pictures we have in the papers" then we are going to read what the chant tells us about the monsters, do you</li> </ul>	<p>At this time, students demonstrate that they understand more than before I could infer it because of their facial expressions. They do</p>

	<p>see the monsters? Yes.. How many monsters do you see? They didn't understand the question, so she gave a number. Ten? Five? Students say no (Spanish accent) "dos". So, she repeated the question: how many? And students answer "two". A student said "ahh two monsters".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Teacher asked: What are the monsters doing? And Some of them said "jumping"... What else? Sofa... cookies. So teacher helped them: eating cookies, good!</li> </ul> <p>Annex 28, August 17, 2006</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Teacher started giving them the exams and then explained each part. "First you're going to write the expression that best describes the pictures. (I love... I prefer... I like... I don't like). Some of them understood but some others not, so T. repeated "you have to write" (making gestures), and they said "ahhh... tenemos que escribir." Yes you have to. While some students were writing, one of them asked her. Teacher ¿pero cómo escribo "I don't like"? So T. gave examples, making gestures, "I love chicken" and I wrote it on the board, and so on with the rest of the expressions. Then all of them understood and did it correctly.</li> <li>- After that, a student asked her: "teacher así? To confirm if it was ok. And she answered yes, but look (pointing) where are the ears? And he said ¡ahhh me falta!</li> <li>- Another student asked: teacher, ¿qué es iting? In that moment another student came and told the other: ¡no sabe qué es eso, eso es comer! The same student asked her "¿teacher qué es frog"? So she asked him, how many green animals can you see? He didn't say a thing, he just pointed the turtle, so I said, no, that's turtle, and he said: ahh ya entendí es rana, ¿cierto? Teacher answered yes that's a frog. At the end a student asked her "teacher no</li> </ul>	<p>not look like if they were hearing an "alien".</p> <p>They are also showing one of the steps a foreign language learner should pass by: As they see the teacher speaking in English all the time, they tried to speak less in Spanish and listen more. (Silent period).</p> <p>In spite of the comprehensible input children receive, they need to ask again in Spanish to confirm what they heard and be sure of what they have to do.</p> <p>Spanish is the mean of negotiate meaning among the student too. The interaction during the English activities is done in the mother tongue.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>entiendo qué es /orse/" and she said: you don't understand because it's not orse/ but /h... and he said yes, teacher pero ¿cuál animal es? Ok, I said, do you remember woody? He said yes, ok who was his best friend? Ahh el caballo, he answered. She confirmed saying, yes that's a horse. The child said, ahh thank you teacher.</p>	<p>The majority of students do not have problems understanding the vocabulary given by the teacher. But it is noticeable, that children present interference when trying to produce English sounds</p>
--	---	--

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baudoin, E. M. et. Al. 1993. *Reader's Choice*. International Edition, Book 1. The University of Michigan Press.

Doughty, Catherine, and J. Williams. 1998. *Focus On Form In Classroom Second Language Acquisition*. (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Cambridge University Press.

Dulay, H. C., M. K. Burt, and S. Krashen. 1982. *Language Two*. Oxford University Press.

Elliot, J. 1991. *Action Research for Educational Change*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Felix, S. 1980. *The effect of formal instruction on second language learning*. Paper presented at Los Angeles Second Language Research Forum, UCLA, February, 1980.

Fuchs, M., and M. Bonner. 1995. *Focus on Grammar*. A High-Intermediate Course for Reference and Practice. Longman Grammar Series. Volume A and B. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.

Gass, Susan M., and J. Schachter. 1989. *Linguistic Perspectives on L2 Acquisition*. Cambridge Applied Linguistics.

Katz, J.J. 1975. Analyticity and contradiction in natural language. In *The Structure of Language: Readings in the Philosophy of Language*, J. A. Fodor and J. J. Katz, eds. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Krahnke, k. 1987. *Approaches to Syllabus Design for Foreign Language Teaching*. New York: Prentice Hall. In Richards 2001.

Krashen, Stephen D. 1987. *Principals and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Prentice – Hall International, Language teaching methodology series, UK.

Jackendoff, R. 1983. *Semantics and Cognition*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Lane, J., and E. Lange. 1993. *Writing Clearly*. Heinle & Heinle Publishers. USA.

Lewis, Michael. 1993. *The Lexical Approach*. Language Teaching Publications.

Littlewood, William T. 1998. *Foreign and Second Language Learning*. Cambridge University Press.

Macintyre, C. 2002. *The Art of the Action Research in the Classroom*. London: David Fulton.

Olsen, R., and S. Kagan. 1992. About cooperative learning. In C. Kessler (ed.), *Cooperative Language Learning: A Teacher's Resource Book*. New York: Prentice Hall. 1-30.

Putnam, H. 1975. The meaning of "meaning." In *Language, Mind, and Knowledge*, K. Gunderson, ed. Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science, Vol. 7. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Quine, W. V. 1959. Meaning and translation. In *On Translation*, r. a. Browner, ed. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Richards, Jack C., and T. Rodgers. 1988. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Richards, Jack C., and T. Rodgers. 2001. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Cambridge University Press.

Rivers, Wilga M. 1983. *Communicating Naturally in a Second Language*. Cambridge Language Teaching Library.

Rod, Ellis. 1987. *Second Language Acquisition in Context*. Prentice – Hall International, English Language teaching, UK.

Schumann, J. H. 1982. Simplification, transfer and relexification as aspects of pidginization and early second language learning. *Language Learning* 32(2): 337-66.

Selinker, L. 1972. *Interlanguage*. IRAL vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 201-31. Reprinted in Richards, 1988.

Skinner, B.F. 1957. *Verbal Behavior*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Swam, Michael, and B. Smith. 2001. *Learner English, a Teacher's Guide to Interference and Other Problems*. (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Cambridge University Press.